



Adobe Acrobat Reader

Finding Words

You can use the Find command to find a complete word or part of a word in the current PDF document. Acrobat Reader looks for the word by reading every word on every page in the file, including text in form fields.

To find a word using the Find command:

- 1. Click the Find button (**Binoculars**), or choose Edit > Find.
- 2. Enter the text to find in the text box.
- 3. Select search options if necessary: Match Whole Word Only finds only occurrences of the complete word you enter in the box. For example, if you search for the word *stick*, the words *tick* and *sticky* will not be highlighted.

Match Case finds only words that contain exactly the same capitalization you enter in the box.

Find Backwards starts the search from the current page and goes backwards through the document.

4. Click Find. Acrobat Reader finds the next occurrence of the word.

To find the next occurrence of the word, Do one of the following:

Choose Edit > Find Again Reopen the find dialog box, and click Find Again. (The word must already be in the Find text box.)

Copying and pasting text and graphics to another application

You can select text or a graphic in a PDF document, copy it to the Clipboard, and paste it into another application such as a word processor. You can also paste text into a PDF document note or into a bookmark. Once the selected text or graphic is on the Clipboard, you can switch to another application and paste it into another document.

Note: If a font copied from a PDF document is not available on the system displaying the copied text, the font cannot be preserved. A default font is substituted.



To select and copy it to the clipboard:

1. Select the text tool T, and do one of the following: To select a line of text, select the first letter of the sentence or phrase and drag to the last letter.

To select multiple columns of text (horizontally), hold down Ctrl+Alt (Windows) or Option (Mac OS) as you drag across the width of the document.

To select a column of text (vertically), Hold down Ctrl+Alt (Windows) or Option+Command (Mac OS) as you drag the length of the document.

To select all the text on the page, choose Edit > Select All. In single page mode, all the text on the current page is selected. In Continuous or Continuous – facing mode, most of the text in the document is selected. When you release the mouse button, the selected text is highlighted. To deselect the text and start over, click anywhere outside the selected text. The Select All command will not select all the text in the document. A workaround for this (Windows) is to use the Edit > Copy command. Choose Edit > Copy to copy the selected text to the clipboard.

2. To view the text, choose Window > Show Clipboard

In Windows 95, the Clipboard Viewer is not installed by default and you cannot use the Show Clipboard command until it is installed. To install the Clipboard Viewer, Choose Start > Settings > Control Panel > Add/Remove Programs, and then click the Windows Setup tab. Double-click Accessories, check Clipboard Viewer, and click OK.



1	LOS ANGELES COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
2	BUDGET DELIBERATIONS
3	MONDAY, JUNE 18, 2007
4	
5	
6	
7	SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF
8	SUPERVISORS FOR MONDAY, JUNE THE 18TH, ON THE BUDGET AND THE
9	FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS IS ITEM NUMBER 1. IT'S A PRETTY GOOD
10	GUESS, WASN'T IT? [LAUGHTER]
11	
12	SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. WHERE IS MR. JANSSEN?
13	
14	CLERK SACHI HAMAI: I THINK WE'RE WAITING FOR WHILE WE'RE
15	WAITING, ON ITEM 5.
16	
17	SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YES?
18	
19	CLERK SACHI HAMAI: SUPERVISOR MOLINA WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST
20	THAT THIS ITEM IS CONTINUED TO THE MEETING OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL
21	BUDGET? IF WE COULD TAKE CARE OF THAT RIGHT NOW? ITEM NUMBER
22	5.
23	



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE COST LITIGATION REPORT FROM COUNTY
- 2 COUNCIL. IN SEPTEMBER, WE'LL HAVE A FULL YEAR'S OF
- 3 INFORMATION.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO YOU WANT THIS CONTINUED UNTIL
- 6 WHEN?

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SUPPLEMENTAL.

9

10 CLERK SACHI HAMAI: SUPPLEMENTAL.

11

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: 'TIL SEPTEMBER? OKAY, WITHOUT
- 13 OBJECTION, THAT WILL BE THE ORDER. MR. JANSSEN?

- 15 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIR. IT'S MY INTENT TO WALK
- 16 THROUGH THE ITEMS IN ORDER, STARTING WITH THE CURRENT YEAR.
- 17 LET ME JUST GIVE YOU AN OVERVIEW FOR THE PUBLIC THAT MAY BE
- 18 WATCHING THIS AT SOME POINT. THE PROPOSED BUDGET AND ADDITIONS
- 19 THAT ARE BEFORE YOU TODAY, WHICH CONSTITUTE THE FINAL BUDGET,
- 20 INCLUDE WHAT WE PRESENTED IN APRIL. SO I'M NOT GOING TO BE
- 21 REPRESENTING THE OVERALL BUDGET FROM APRIL OTHER THAN TO
- 22 INDICATE IN THE BUDGET THAT YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO APPROVE
- 23 TODAY, THERE ARE SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN PUBLIC SAFETY,
- 24 INCREASES IN GANGS, A RATHER LARGE CAPITAL PROGRAM THAT WE ARE
- 25 PROPOSING TO ADD TO TODAY. ITEM NUMBER 1 IS CLOSING OUT THE



- 1 CURRENT YEAR AND THERE ARE A NUMBER OF TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS
- 2 IN ITEM NUMBER 1 THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY, BOTH IN OPERATIONS AND
- 3 IN CAPITAL PROJECTS. WE BELIEVE MOST OF THESE TO BE, IF NOT
- 4 ALL OF THEM, TO BE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS, THE LARGEST OF WHICH
- 5 IS TO DISTRIBUTE TO DEPARTMENTS THE COST OF SALARY INCREASES
- 6 FOR THE CURRENT YEAR. ABOUT \$55 MILLION OF THAT SITS IN A
- 7 CENTRAL ACCOUNT. WE'RE DISTRIBUTING IT INTO DEPARTMENTS SO
- 8 THAT THEY CAN END THE YEAR WITH BUDGETS THAT ARE BALANCED.
- 9 THERE'S ALSO A \$900,000 INCREASE FOR THE SUMMER GANG
- 10 SUPPRESSION PROGRAM WHICH IS FULLY FUNDED IN THE PROPOSED
- 11 BUDGET BUT IT'S STARTED ALREADY SO WE NEED TO ADD MONEY NOW TO
- 12 THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT. WE'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
- 13 OUESTIONS YOU HAVE ON ITEM NUMBER 1 BUT RECOMMEND THAT YOU
- 14 APPROVE THE CHANGES TO THE CURRENT BUDGET. THEY'RE TECHNICAL
- 15 ADJUSTMENTS, MR. CHAIR, TO THE CURRENT BUDGET, '06/'07.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: DO YOU HAVE A MORE COMPLETE REPORT
- 18 ON THE REST OF THE BUDGET OR IS THAT...

19

- 20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I HAVE MORE OF A REPORT ON THE CHANGE LETTER,
- 21 ADDITIONS TO THE BUDGET BUT NOT ON THE BASE BUDGET.

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SO WE'LL WAIT 'TIL WE
- 24 GET TO THAT. IS THERE-- SHOULD WE GET THE LIGHTS BACK ON,
- 25 THEN? MR. KNABE?



1

- 2 SUP. KNABE: THERE WAS-- I'M TRYING TO LOCATE IT, I THINK IT'S
- 3 WITHIN THE CONFINES OF ITEM NUMBER 1 ON THE REPORT BUT A
- 4 TRANSFER OF DOLLARS OF COST SAVINGS FROM RANCHO THAT WAS
- 5 RECOMMENDED TO GO BACK INTO THE...

6

7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I BELIEVE IT WAS \$18 MILLION. ITEM-- PAGE 3.

8

- 9 SUP. KNABE: I MEAN, OBVIOUSLY, I HAVE, YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE
- 10 HISTORICALLY-- OH, EXCUSE ME.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS HAS TO DO WITH THE WAY THE BUDGET WAS PUT
- 13 TOGETHER THIS YEAR AND THEY USED THE WRONG DESIGNATION. THEY
- 14 SHOULD HAVE USED A RANCHO DESIGNATION FOR RANCHO SO IT'S JUST
- 15 A TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENT OF DOLLARS. IT'S NOT EGGING MONEY OUT
- 16 OF RANCHO.

17

- 18 SUP. KNABE: WELL, I MEAN, BECAUSE, HISTORICALLY, THE COST
- 19 SAVINGS WE HAVE KEPT AT THE HOSPITAL ITSELF, WHETHER IT BE
- 20 RANCHO, WHETHER IT BE COUNTY U.S.C. WHEN YOU SAY A TECHNICAL
- 21 ADJUSTMENT, DOES THEN THAT MEAN THAT IT WILL BE DESIGNATED FOR
- 22 RANCHO, IS THAT CORRECT? I MEAN...

- 24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT SHOULD COME-- THE 18-1/2 MILLION IN THE
- 25 PROPOSED BUDGET, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, DEBBIE, CAME OUT OF



- 1 THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S DESIGNATION. IT SHOULD HAVE COME OUT
- 2 OF THE RANCHO DESIGNATION WHEN WE PUT THE BUDGET TOGETHER FOR
- 3 THE CURRENT YEAR. SO THIS IS JUST CLEANING UP THE TRANSFER OF
- 4 THE MONEY.

5

- 6 SUP. KNABE: OKAY. BUT IT STILL WILL BE DESIGNATED, THEN, FOR
- 7 RANCHO, IS THAT CORRECT?

8

9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES.

10

11 SUP. KNABE: OKAY.

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THAT'S IT? ANY OTHER DISCUSSION ON
- 14 ITEM NUMBER 1? IF NOT...

15

16 SUP. KNABE: NO. THAT WAS THE ONLY QUESTION I HAD.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IF NOT, MR. KNABE MOVES, MS.
- 19 MOLINA SECONDS, WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE ON ITEM
- 20 NUMBER 1.

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM NUMBER 2 IS THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S
- 23 BUDGET COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE PRESENTATION. THE DEPARTMENT IS
- 24 HERE TO MAKE THAT PRESENTATION TO YOU AND THEIR BUDGET
- 25 ADJUSTMENTS ARE INCLUDED IN ITEM NUMBER 6. DR. CHERNOF?



1

- 2 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: GOOD MORNING, CHAIR, SUPERVISORS, I'M GOING
- 3 TO HAVE ALAN WECKER, OUR ACTING C.F.O., MAKE SOME OPENING
- 4 COMMENTS FOR YOU.

- 6 ALAN WECKER: GREAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH. BEFORE YOU IS OUR
- 7 DEPARTMENT'S FIVE-YEAR FISCAL OUTLOOK. SINCE OUR LAST UPDATE
- 8 TO THE BOARD, WE'VE SEEN AN IMPROVEMENT IN OUR FORECAST
- 9 THROUGH FISCAL YEAR '07/'08 OF \$100 MILLION. THERE ARE FIVE
- 10 MAJOR REASONS FOR THIS IMPROVEMENT. ONE, OUR DEPARTMENT HAS
- 11 MADE EFFORTS TO MAXIMIZE REVENUE UNDER MEDICAL REDESIGN. TWO,
- 12 SECTION 1011 COLLECTIONS HAS BEEN PROJECTED THROUGH THE END OF
- 13 THE PROGRAM. THREE, COST REDUCTIONS FROM THE METROCARE
- 14 STAFFING PLAN. FOUR, THE USE OF ONE-TIME MEASURE B FUNDS TO
- 15 PAY FOR UN-REIMBURSED EMERGENCY CARE COSTS AT OUR HOSPITALS.
- 16 AND, FIVE, THE USE OF TOBACCO SETTLEMENT FUNDS TO PAY FOR
- 17 CAPITAL PROJECTS RELATING TO THE U.S.C. TRANSITION PLAN.
- 18 ADDITIONALLY, OUR FISCAL FORECAST INCLUDES ADJUSTMENTS FOR
- 19 NURSING SALARY INCREASES AND THE PENDING PHYSICIAN PAY PLAN.
- 20 THE FOLLOWING ARE MAJOR FEDERAL ISSUES THAT HAVE IMPACTED OUR
- 21 FISCAL OUTLOOK SINCE WE LAST REPORTED TO THE BOARD. C.M.S.
- 22 ISSUED THE MEDICAID COST LIMITATION REGULATION; HOWEVER, A
- 23 CONGRESSIONAL MORATORIUM PROHIBITING IMPLEMENTATION WAS SIGNED
- 24 BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE FINAL RULE CAN'T TAKE EFFECT BEFORE
- 25 MAY 25TH, 2008. C.M.S. STATES THAT CALIFORNIA'S 1115 WAIVER IS



- 1 LARGELY CONSISTENT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE RULE; THEREFORE,
- 2 IT IS UNLIKELY THAT THE FIRST FIVE YEARS WOULD BE ADVERSELY
- 3 AFFECTED. HOWEVER, C.M.S. PROVIDES NO SUCH ASSURANCES ABOUT
- 4 RETAINING FULL FUNDING IN ANY WAIVER OF RENEWAL. C.M.S. HAS
- 5 SENT QUESTIONS BASED ON THEIR REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED MEDICAL
- 6 MANAGED CARE RATE SUPPLEMENT. THE DEPARTMENT'S RESPONSES WILL
- 7 BE FORWARDED TO C.M.S. BEFORE THE END OF THE MONTH. BASED ON
- 8 THE CURRENT TIMELINE, WE'RE EXPECTING, BY THE END OF AUGUST,
- 9 TO HAVE C.M.S.'S INITIAL RESPONSE REGARDING THE MANAGED CARE
- 10 RATE SUPPLEMENT. WE ARE PROJECTING THAT, AT THE END OF FISCAL
- 11 YEAR '07/'08, THE DEPARTMENT'S DESIGNATION ACCOUNT WILL HAVE A
- 12 BALANCE OF \$120 MILLION. HOWEVER, THIS BALANCE FROM THE
- 13 DESIGNATION IS ASSUMING THE RECEIPT OF TWO YEARS OF FEDERAL
- 14 FUNDING, WORTH \$160 MILLION, FROM THE MANAGED CARE RATE
- 15 SUPPLEMENT. IF C.M.S. DOES NOT APPROVE THE RATE SUPPLEMENT,
- 16 OUR FISCAL YEAR '07/'08 BALANCE IN THE DESIGNATION ACCOUNT
- 17 WILL GO FROM A BALANCE OF 120 TO A DEFICIT OF \$40 MILLION.
- 18 HOWEVER, THERE ARE TWO PENDING C.M.S. ISSUES THAT MAY HAVE A
- 19 POSITIVE IMPACT ON THE BALANCE IN THE DESIGNATION ACCOUNT. THE
- 20 MANAGED CARE RATE SUPPLEMENT IS COMPRISED OF VARIOUS SECTIONS.
- 21 C.M.S. HAS THE AUTHORITY TO APPROVE SOME OR ALL OF THESE
- 22 SECTIONS. DUE TO RECENT PROPOSED FUNDING CHANGES AND OUR
- 23 CLARIFICATIONS BY C.M.S., CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE MANAGED CARE
- 24 RATE SUPPLEMENT HAVE A GREATER CHANCE OF APPROVAL THAN OTHERS.
- 25 TWO, WE ARE STILL NEGOTIATING WITH C.M.S. OVER THE METHODOLOGY



- 1 ON PAYING FOR PHYSICIAN SERVICES FOR THE MEDICAL POPULATION.
- 2 THESE NEGOTIATIONS HAVE BEEN GOING ON FOR ALMOST TWO YEARS.
- 3 OVER THE LAST FEW DAYS, IT SEEMS THAT WE'RE GETTING CLOSE TO
- 4 RESOLVING THE FINAL OUTSTANDING ISSUES. IF WE FACTOR IN THE
- 5 ADDITIONAL FUNDS FROM THESE TWO ITEMS, OUR FISCAL YEAR '07/'08
- 6 ENDING BALANCE IN OUR DESIGNATION ACCOUNT WILL HAVE A SURPLUS
- 7 OF \$23 MILLION. OVER THE NEXT THREE MONTHS, OUR DEPARTMENT
- 8 WILL BE INVOLVED IN NEGOTIATIONS WITH C.M.S. OVER FEDERAL
- 9 ISSUES AND THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE AND THE LEGISLATURE OVER
- 10 HEALTHCARE REFORM. THE OUTCOME OF THESE ISSUES WILL HAVE A
- 11 MAJOR IMPACT ON THE FINANCES AND THE OPERATIONS OF THE
- 12 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: HOW MUCH ARE MEASURE B FUNDS AND

- 15 HOW MUCH OF TOBACCO SETTLEMENT FUNDS ARE BEING USED ON A ONE-
- 16 TIME BASIS THAT YOU INDICATED AT THE OUTSET OF YOUR
- 17 PRESENTATION?

19 ALAN WECKER: 25 MILLION OF MEASURE B IS ARE BEING USED AND

- 20 THERE'S 25 MILLION FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS. LET ME SEE IF THERE'S
- 21 SOMETHING ELSE.
- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHAT ARE THE MEASURE B FUNDS BEING
- 24 USED FOR SPECIFICALLY?

25

22

13



- 1 ALAN WECKER: THEY'RE GOING TO BE USED FOR THE UNREIMBURSED
- 2 COSTS. WE STILL HAVE ADDITIONAL UNREIMBURSED COSTS AT OUR
- 3 EMERGENCY ROOM AND THE PATIENTS THAT GET CHECKED IN. THE
- 4 CURRENT MEASURE B FUNDS WE'RE GETTING DOES NOT COVER ALL OUR
- 5 COSTS. THIS WOULD BE THE ADDITIONAL TO AT LEAST CLOSE THE GAP
- 6 OF WHAT OUR COSTS ARE AND THE REVENUES. RIGHT NOW...

8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHERE ARE YOU GETTING THE MEASURE

9 B FUNDS FROM?

10

7

- 11 ALAN WECKER: RIGHT NOW, THERE IS A EXCESS FUNDING IN MEASURE B
- 12 OF ABOUT \$26 MILLION. MOST OF IT WAS FROM THE FIRST TWO YEARS
- 13 OF MEASURE B, 03/'04 AND '04/'05. THAT WAS ABOUT \$25 MILLION.
- 14 SO IT'S REALLY THE AMOUNT THAT'S BEEN IN THE FUND FOR A COUPLE
- 15 OF YEARS. WE'RE NOT IMPACTING THE CURRENT AMOUNT AT ALL.
- 16 THERE'S STILL AMOUNTS OF 4.5 FOR ACCESS AT SAN GABRIEL AND
- 17 ANTELOPE VALLEYS SO THEY'RE NOT BEING IMPACTED AT ALL. AND,
- 18 EVEN WITH THE 25 MILLION WE EXPECT IN '07/'08, WE'LL HAVE
- 19 STILL A SURPLUS IN THE FUNDS OF \$4.5 MILLION.

21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THE PURPOSE FOR WHICH THESE ONE

- 22 TIME FUNDS ARE BEING USED ARE FOR ONGOING COSTS OR DO YOU SEE
- 23 THESE AS ONE TIME COSTS?

24



- 1 ALAN WECKER: FOR MEASURE B, IT WOULD BE BECAUSE OF THE COSTS
- 2 THAT WE HAVE IN OUR EMERGENCY ROOM, THESE COSTS TECHNICALLY
- 3 ARE ONGOING BUT THIS HELPS WITH BASICALLY OUR BOTTOM LINE. IF
- 4 YOU NOTICE AT THE END WE BASICALLY HAD A SURPLUS OF \$23
- 5 MILLION. WITHOUT THE \$25 MILLION FROM MEASURE B, WE'D ACTUALLY
- 6 BE RUNNING A DEFICIT OF ABOUT 2 MILLION.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YEAH, BUT THAT WASN'T MY QUESTION.
- 9 MY QUESTION IS, WE DON'T TEND, AS A POLICY, TO USE ONE-TIME
- 10 MONIES TO FUND ONGOING EXPENSES BECAUSE THEY'RE NOT
- 11 SUSTAINABLE. IN OTHER WORDS, WHAT WILL WE DO NEXT YEAR? THIS
- 12 RESERVE, THIS UNSPENT PROP B MONEY WILL BE GONE BUT THE
- 13 EXPENSES WILL NOT BE. SO WHAT'S THE RATIONALE FOR DOING
- 14 SOMETHING THAT WE NEVER DO?

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MR. CHAIRMAN, YOU'RE ABSOLUTELY RIGHT ABOUT
- 17 THE POLICY AS IT RELATES TO THE GENERAL FUND. THAT POLICY HAS
- 18 NOT BEEN FOLLOWED IN THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT BECAUSE WE HAVE
- 19 USED RESERVES, AS YOU KNOW, TO CONTINUE TO PUSH OFF THE
- 20 DEFICIT YEAR TO YEAR. SO IT IS A NORMAL PRACTICE,
- 21 UNFORTUNATELY, IN THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT TO KEEP THE SERVICES
- 22 GOING TO USE THE GENERAL RESERVE AS PART OF THE OPERATING
- 23 BUDGET. AND THAT'S WHY, IN THE FOLLOWING YEAR, IN '07/'08 THE
- 24 DEFICIT REAPPEARS. AND, IN THE FIFTH YEAR, IT'S ABOUT \$650
- 25 MILLION. SO IT'S NOT A GOOD POLICY BUT THE ALTERNATIVE IS TO



- 1 CUT PROGRAMS. AND THE DEPARTMENT IS WORKING ON THAT AND WE'LL
- 2 HAVE A PACKAGE FOR DISCUSSION IN SEPTEMBER ON WHERE YOU COULD
- 3 MAKE REDUCTIONS IN SERVICES. THE REASON-- NOW, WE COULD USE A
- 4 LAST-IN, LAST-OUT WITH THIS MONEY. IF WE ARE ABLE TO END THE
- 5 FISCAL YEAR WITH \$120 MILLION SURPLUS, YOU COULD PUT THE 25
- 6 MILLION BACK IN THE PROP MEASURE B FUND AND THEN YOUR SURPLUS
- 7 WOULD BE ABOUT \$95 MILLION. SO WE COULD LOOK AT IT THAT WAY.
- 8 BUT IT IS NEEDED TO PROPOSE A BALANCED BUDGET.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IN THE PAST, COULD YOU GIVE ME AN
- 11 EXAMPLE HER YOU USED ONE-TIME MONIES OTHER THAN FUND BALANCE?

12

13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, THAT IS ONE-TIME MONEY.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, YEAH, IT'S ONE-TIME MONEY
- 16 EXCEPT IT REAPPEARS EVERY YEAR.

17

- 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IN THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT OR IN THE GENERAL
- 19 BUDGET?

20

- 21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IN THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT. WHAT IS
- 22 YOUR FUND BALANCE GOING TO BE THIS YEAR? 100 AND WHAT MILLION
- 23 DOLLARS?



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ABOUT \$157 MILLION, I THINK? THE DESIGNATION,
- 2 AT ONE TIME, WAS 400 MILLION. WE'VE BEEN USING IT...

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I UNDERSTAND. A COUPLE WEEKS AGO,
- 5 IT WAS NEGATIVE. AND THEN, NOW, ALL OF A SUDDEN IT'S 150
- 6 POSITIVE. SO ALL I'M SAYING-- WHERE HAVE WE EVER DIPPED INTO A
- 7 RESERVE OTHER THAN THAT, OTHER THAN FUND BALANCE TO...

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, THE DESIGNATION IS A RESERVE. THE HEALTH
- 10 DEPARTMENT DESIGNATION IS A RESERVE.

11

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YEAH, BUT IT'S LARGELY FUNDED BY
- 13 THESE KINDS OF DEVELOPMENTS TO THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR, IS
- 14 IT NOT? FUND BALANCE?

15

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ADDITIONAL, YES. ADDITIONAL REVENUES, RIGHT,
- 17 EXACTLY.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: 90% IF NOT MORE IS FUND BALANCE,
- 20 AS IT IS IN VIRTUALLY EVERY OTHER DEPARTMENT IN THE COUNTY. SO
- 21 ALL I'M SAYING IS, I MEAN, WHEN WE USED THE TOBACCO SETTLEMENT
- 22 MONEY, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, WE'RE USING IT FOR ONE-TIME
- 23 EXPENDITURES.

24

25 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT.



1

- 2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: UNDER THE CAPITAL EXPENDITURES.
- 3 THIS ACCUMULATION IS BEING USED ON A ONE-TIME-- IT'S A ONE-
- 4 TIME ACCUMULATION THAT'S GOING TO BE USED FOR ONGOING
- 5 EXPENDITURES. WAS IT YOUR INTENT TO -- WAS IT YOUR INTENT TO DO
- 6 A LAST-IN, LAST-OUT APPROACH TO THIS?

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO. BUT THAT CERTAINLY IS SOMETHING THAT'S
- 9 EASY TO DO IF THE BOARD IS CONCERNED ABOUT THE USE OF THESE
- 10 PARTICULAR FUNDS AND I CERTAINLY UNDERSTAND WHY YOU WOULD BE.
- 11 WE COULD DO IT FIRST-IN, LAST- IN, FIRST-OUT.

12

13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YEAH, IF YOU DON'T NEED THEM...

14

15 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THEN WE CAN PUT IT BACK.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IF YOU DON'T NEED THEM THEN, I
- 18 MEAN, I WOULD ASK THAT YOU...

19

- 20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S FINE. MAKE A MOTION TO THAT EFFECT AND
- 21 THAT WILL BE THE DIRECTION.

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WOULD THERE BE ANY OBJECTION TO
- 24 THAT?



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW THAT WOULD OPERATE
- 2 DIFFERENTLY.

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, AT THE END OF THE '07/'08 YEAR, IF WE'VE
- 5 RECEIVED OUR MANAGED CARE RATE INCREASE OR ANY OTHER
- 6 ADJUSTMENTS IN THE PHYSICIANS ACCOUNTS, ET CETERA, AND THE
- 7 DEPARTMENT HAS A SURPLUS OF-- A RESERVE SURPLUS OF \$120
- 8 MILLION, WE WOULD SHIFT OR WE WOULD ASK YOU TO SHIFT 25
- 9 MILLION OF THAT BACK INTO THE MEASURE B RESERVE. THAT'S HOW IT
- 10 WOULD WORK.

11

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. IF THERE'S NO OBJECTION
- 13 TO THAT, THEN CONSIDER YOURSELF DIRECTED TO DO THAT. WE DON'T
- 14 HAVE TO GO-- NO. JUST LAST-IN, LAST-OUT. IF WE NEED IT, WE'LL
- 15 USE IT. IF YOU DON'T NEED IT, IT STAYS IN THE RESERVE.

16

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT STAYS IN THE RESERVE.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SUPERVISOR BURKE AND THEN MR.
- 20 KNABE AND THEN MR. ANTONOVICH.

- 22 SUP. BURKE: ON THE ITEM 9, THE METROCARE, THE 9 MILLION FOR
- 23 '06/'07 AND 44.3, IS THAT THE DIFFERENCE? IS THAT MONEY THAT
- 24 WAS PICKED UP FROM THE INSTITUTION OF METRO CARE AND WHERE
- 25 DOES THAT COME FROM PRIMARILY?



1

2 ALAN WECKER: THE INFORMATION THAT YOU'RE LOOKING AT IS REALLY

- 3 A CHANGE FROM OUR PROPOSED BUDGET TO THE FINAL BUDGET AND
- 4 WHAT'S SITTING IN THERE IS THERE WAS AN ASSUMPTION THAT--
- 5 OKAY, SORRY. THERE WAS AN ASSUMPTION THAT 60 PERCENT OF THE
- 6 EMPLOYEES AT M.L.K. WOULD BE MITIGATED TO DIFFERENT PARTS OF
- 7 OUR HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEM AND BASICALLY WITH THE COST OF
- 8 THOSE EMPLOYEES, WE WERE ASSUMING TO BE SOMEWHERE AROUND \$44
- 9 MILLION. IN REALITY, WHAT ENDED UP OCCURRING WAS THAT THERE
- 10 WAS ONLY 391 EMPLOYEES MITIGATED TO OUR OTHER FACILITIES. WE
- 11 WERE ABLE TO KEEP THEM WITHIN THE CURRENT BUDGET AND IT ONLY
- 12 COSTS US \$6 MILLION. SO THERE YOU'RE LOOKING AT ABOUT A \$38
- 13 MILLION SAVINGS. THE OTHER PART THAT YOU'RE LOOKING AT WAS, IN
- 14 OLIVE VIEW MEDICAL CENTER, WHAT ENDED UP OCCURRING IS WE HAD
- 15 ALLOCATED FUNDS FOR PATIENTS FROM KING TO GO TO OLIVE VIEW.
- 16 THAT NEVER OCCURRED SO WE NEVER HAD IT. SO WHAT YOU'RE LOOKING
- 17 HERE IS REALLY THE CHANGE. WHAT THIS BUDGET AND THESE NUMBERS
- 18 REPRESENT IS THE CHANGE FROM THE PROPOSED BUDGET TO FINAL
- 19 CHANGES AND THAT'S WHAT'S REPRESENTED IN THE NUMBERS THAT
- 20 YOU'RE LOOKING ON IN THE SCHEDULE. WE HAD ALREADY INCLUDED
- 21 SOME OF THE COSTS OF METROCARE ORIGINALLY IN THE PROPOSED
- 22 BUDGET AND WHAT YOU'RE SEEING IS THE CHANGE IN DIFFERENTIAL.
- 23 OKAY. THE COST...



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS-- I MEAN, MR. CHAIRMAN, THIS IS REALLY
- 2 VERY GOOD NEWS FOR THE DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET. IF YOU REMEMBER,
- 3 YOU DECIDED NOT TO LAY OFF ANYONE FROM M.L.K. AS A RESULT OF
- 4 THE DOWNSIZING IN METROCARE. THE DEPARTMENT, AT THAT TIME,
- 5 GAVE THE ONLY ESTIMATE THEY COULD AS TO WHAT THAT MIGHT COST
- 6 AND THAT WAS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF \$40 MILLION. IN FACT, THEY
- 7 HAVE BEEN ABLE TO EITHER ABSORB IN EXISTING BUDGETED POSITIONS
- 8 ELSEWHERE IN THE DEPARTMENT OR PEOPLE HAVE TRANSITIONED OUT,
- 9 ET CETERA, SO THAT IT ACTUALLY COST ONLY \$6 MILLION.

11 SUP. BURKE: THANK YOU.

13 SUP. MOLINA: ON THAT SAME ISSUE, DO YOU WANT TO STAY ON THAT

14 ISSUE?

10

12

15

18

21

23

16 SUP. BURKE: I HAVE TO DIGEST EXACTLY WHERE THEY WENT BUT GO

17 AHEAD, YES.

19 SUP. MOLINA: NO, I WANT YOU TO-- BECAUSE I'M GOING TO-- I WANT

20 TO ADDRESS THAT ISSUE BUT I CAN WAIT MY TURN.

22 SUP. BURKE: NO, GO AHEAD. I THINK WE SHOULD FINISH.

24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IF IT'S BRIEF. I MEAN...



1 SUP. MOLINA: NO.

2

- 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ...IF IT'S ON THIS POINT. IT WON'T
- 4 BE BRIEF. ALL RIGHT SO LET'S WAIT BECAUSE MR. KNABE WAS NEXT,
- 5 THEN ANTONOVICH, THEN MRS. MOLINA.

6

- 7 SUP. KNABE: YEAH, JUST A CLARIFICATION. I MEAN, OBVIOUSLY, I'M
- 8 NOT SURE THAT'S A TOTALLY ACCURATE PICTURE BECAUSE YOU'RE
- 9 REALLY USING RESERVES TO COVER THOSE COSTS, IS THAT CORRECT?

10

11 ALAN WECKER: YES.

12

- 13 SUP. KNABE: AND THEN I WOULD SUPPORT, TOO, AND I GUESS WE'VE
- 14 ALREADY DIRECTED ON THIS REPAYMENT OF MEASURE B, BECAUSE,
- 15 OBVIOUSLY, THAT DISCUSSION HAS NEVER TAKEN PLACE BEFORE THIS
- 16 BOARD AS A POLICY HOW THAT MONEY IS TO BE DIRECTED OR SPENT
- 17 WITHIN INSIDE THE DEPARTMENT AND IT'S A HUGE ISSUE. THE OTHER
- 18 THING IS THE MANAGED CARE SUPPLEMENT? YOU'RE ANTICIPATING A
- 19 VERY SIGNIFICANT AMOUNT OF MONEY FROM THAT. WHAT WOULD BE OUR
- 20 TOTAL EXPOSURE SHOULD THAT NOT BE SUCCESSFUL?

- 22 ALAN WECKER: OVER-- IT WOULD BE \$160 MILLION. THAT'S OVER A
- 23 TWO-YEAR TIME PERIOD. WE'RE ASSUMING APPROXIMATELY 72 MILLION
- 24 IN '06/'07 AND ABOUT 88 MILLION IN '07/08. SO WHAT WE HAVE AT
- 25 RISK IS 160 MAXIMUM. HOWEVER, C.M.S. CAN APPROVE PARTS OF IT



- 1 AND WE BELIEVE THAT CERTAIN PARTS OF IT HAVE A BETTER CHANCE
- 2 OF BEING APPROVED THAN OTHER PARTS SO IT'S NOT...

3

- 4 SUP. KNABE: AND THAT PORTION THAT HAS A BETTER CHANCE, WHAT
- 5 NUMBER IS THAT, INSIDE THE 160 MILLION OVER TWO YEARS?

6

7 ALAN WECKER: WE'RE LOOKING AT ABOUT \$50 MILLION.

8

- 9 SUP. KNABE: SO THAT'S A POTENTIAL SIGNIFICANT HIT. I MEAN,
- 10 WHAT'S THE REALITY? IS IT A 50/50? OR IS IT 60/40? IS IT
- 11 70/30?

12

- 13 ALAN WECKER: IT'S REALLY HARD TO TELL RIGHT NOW BECAUSE
- 14 C.M.S., EVERY WEEK, WE GET THINGS IN THE FEDERAL REGISTRY THAT
- 15 KEEPS CHANGING CURRENT POLICIES. IT'S VERY HARD TO TELL WHAT
- 16 THEY ARE DOING. WE DO BELIEVE THAT, BASED ON CURRENT
- 17 INTERPRETATION, WE DO BELIEVE THE WHOLE THING IS-- SHOULD BE
- 18 APPROVED BY C.M.S. BUT, OVER THE LAST YEAR, THEY'VE
- 19 REINTERPRETED THEIR OWN RULES AND THEY'RE LOOKING AT HOW THEY
- 20 REINTERPRET THINGS. THAT'S WHAT'S MAKING THINGS A LITTLE BIT
- 21 HARDER.

- 23 SUP. KNABE: AND WE'RE WATCHING IT VERY CLOSELY SO WE CAN MAKE
- 24 THAT ADJUSTMENT QUICKLY SHOULD THE REGS BE CHANGED



- 1 SIGNIFICANTLY TO CHANGE THE FORMULA THAT YOU'RE COUNTING THAT
- 2 160 MILLION?

3

- 4 ALAN WECKER: YES. WE'RE GOING AHEAD AND WE LOOK AT THE FEDERAL
- 5 REGISTRY ALL THE TIME. WE HAVE OUR LAWYERS LOOKING AT IT, BOTH
- 6 OUR INSIDE AND OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS. AND WE'RE WORKING WITH THE
- 7 STATE THE WHOLE TIME.

8

9 SUP. KNABE: OKAY.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SUPERVISOR? I'M SORRY. MR.
- 12 JANSSEN.

- 14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MR. CHAIR, COULD I RESPOND TO ONE ITEM THAT
- 15 SUPERVISOR KNABE REFERENCED? AND THAT'S THE USE OF THE
- 16 DESIGNATION. IF YOU LOOK AT THE FORECAST, AND REALLY WHAT YOU
- 17 HAVE BEFORE YOU IS THE FIVE-YEAR FORECAST, THE SHORTFALL IN
- 18 '10/'11 IS \$688 MILLION CUMULATIVE. IN '08/'09, ASSUMING WE
- 19 GET THE MANAGED CARE RATE INCREASE, THE DEFICIT REOCCURS AT
- 20 ABOUT \$120 MILLION. THAT MEANS THE RESERVES ARE USED UP AND
- 21 THEN THERE IS AN ACTUAL SHORTFALL FOR THE FOLLOWING YEARS THAT
- 22 CONTINUES TO BUILD, BASED ON THE COST ADJUSTMENTS THAT WE
- 23 HAVE. SO THERE'S GOOD NEWS AND BAD NEWS IN TERMS OF THIS
- 24 BUDGET. THE GOOD NEWS IS THE DEFICIT USED TO BE PROJECTED AT
- 25 ABOUT A BILLION AND A HALF OVER A FIVE-YEAR PERIOD. SO THAT



- 1 IMPROVEMENT HAS BEEN RATHER SUBSTANTIAL OVER THE LAST SEVERAL
- 2 YEARS. THE ASSUMPTIONS THAT HAVE GONE INTO THE HEALTH BUDGET
- 3 HAVE BEEN NUMEROUS OVER THE YEARS, AS WELL. THE ASSUMPTION NOW
- 4 IS, ONE, MANAGED CARE RATE INCREASE. THE OTHER ASSUMPTION,
- 5 WHICH WE'RE ALL IN WASHINGTON TALKING ABOUT, WAS THE PROPOSED
- 6 RULE, THE PROPOSED C.M.S. RULE. IT WAS, IN FACT, INCLUDED IN
- 7 SUPPLEMENTAL. IT WAS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT. THERE'S A ONE-
- 8 YEAR MORATORIUM ON THE RULE. SO THAT \$200 MILLION EXPOSURE HAS
- 9 EVAPORATED. THAT'S NOT THE RIGHT WORD BUT IT HAS BEEN
- 10 DEFERRED. ALTHOUGH, WHEN C.M.S. RESPONDED OR WHEN THEY
- 11 RELEASED THE RULE, WHICH THEY DID, THEY NOTICED, IN THAT
- 12 DOCUMENT, THAT IT DOES NOT APPLY TO CALIFORNIA AS LONG AS OUR
- 13 WAIVER EXISTS. THAT WE HAD NEVER SEEN BEFORE. SO WE ARE OF THE
- 14 OPINION NOW, I BELIEVE, CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG, BRUCE, THAT,
- 15 EVEN WHEN THE ONE YEAR MORATORIUM RUNS, IT WILL NOT EXPOSE
- 16 CALIFORNIA TO THE SHORTFALL AS LONG AS WE HAVE THE WAIVER.

17

- 18 SUP. BURKE: SO DENNIS SMITH WAS CORRECT WHEN HE SAID THAT TO
- 19 US?

20

- 21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: DENNIS SMITH WAS CORRECT WHEN HE SAID THAT.
- 22 THEY HAD NEVER PUT IT IN WRITING, HOWEVER, UNTIL THEY ACTUALLY
- 23 RELEASED THE RULE. SO THE BUDGET INCLUDES FUNDING FOR...

24

25 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO IT'S IN THE RULE?



1

2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT'S IN THE RULE.

3

- 4 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: JUST A SECOND. WHAT DAVID IS SAYING,
- 5 BECAUSE I THINK IT REFLECTS THIS BOARD'S WORK IN WASHINGTON,
- 6 D.C. THAT GETTING C.M.S., DENNIS SMITH, TO PUT IN WRITING
- 7 STATEMENTS THAT HAD BEEN MADE BUT WERE NEVER, YOU KNOW,
- 8 DOCUMENTED, VERY, VERY IMPORTANT AND THE IMPACT OF THAT BODY
- 9 OF WORK THAT WE DID AND THIS BOARD DID IN WASHINGTON RESULTS
- 10 IN MORE THAN \$500 MILLION BECAUSE, EVEN THOUGH THERE'S A ONE-
- 11 YEAR MORATORIUM FOR EVERY OTHER STATE, THERE IS A MORATORIUM
- 12 THROUGH THE END OF THE WAIVER FOR US HERE IN CALIFORNIA. VERY,
- 13 VERY IMPORTANT.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND WHEN DOES THE WAIVER END?

16

- 17 ALAN WECKER: '09/'10. SO IT STARTS IN '10/'11. WE COULD BE
- 18 AT...

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THREE MORE YEARS.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO A COUPLE OF YEARS, TWO, THREE
- 23 YEARS FROM NOW...

24

25 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH, WE'LL BE LOOKING AT IT.

DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: CORRECT.

25



1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO WE'VE GOT A TWO OR THREE-YEAR 2 3 MORATORIUM INSTEAD OF ONE-YEAR MORATORIUM? 4 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. 6 7 SUP. KNABE: BUT INSIDE... 8 SUP. BURKE: BUT WE'VE HAD WAIVERS THE LAST 12 YEARS? 10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, THIS IS THE STATE WAIVER. THIS IS NOT 11 OUR WAIVER. WE NO LONGER HAVE THAT WAIVER, RIGHT. 12 13 SUP. KNABE: BUT THE OTHER BIG ELEPHANT IN THIS IS THE FACT 14 THAT, YOU KNOW, NONE OF THIS INCORPORATES SHOULD SOMETHING 15 HAPPEN TO KING, IS THAT CORRECT? 16 17 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT. 19 20 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THAT'S CORRECT. 21 22 SUP. KNABE: YOU KNOW, WHETHER IT COSTS US MONEY, SAVES US 23 MONEY, I MEAN... 24



SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH? 2 3 SUP. ANTONOVICH: DR. CHERNOF, HOW WOULD THE FISCAL OUTLOOK OF 4 5 THE DEPARTMENT CHANGE IF M.L.K.-HARBOR HOSPITAL HAPPENED TO BE CLOSED DUE TO THE C.M.S. RECOMMENDATION? 6 7 8 ALAN WECKER: WE'RE ANTICIPATING IT WOULD COST US ABOUT \$200 MILLION A YEAR ON FEDERAL REVENUES SO YOU'RE LOOKING AT ABOUT 9 APPROXIMATELY \$200 MILLION PER YEAR HIT ON... 10 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I DIDN'T HEAR THAT. HOW MUCH? 12 13 ALAN WECKER: ABOUT \$200 MILLION. 14 15 16 SUP. ANTONOVICH: ABOUT 200 MILLION. BUT WHAT'S THE CONTINGENCY

1

- PLAN IN CASE THE MANAGED CARE RATE SUPPLEMENTAL IS NOT 17
- 18 GRANTED? WOULD THEN THE C.A.O. RECOMMEND INCREASING THE
- 19 GENERAL FUND AS AN ALTERNATIVE?

- C.A.O. JANSSEN: MR. CHAIRMAN, SUPERVISOR, IF THE MANAGED CARE 21
- 22 RATE INCREASE IS NOT APPROVED IN TOTAL, WE BELIEVE THAT
- THERE'S A VERY GOOD CHANCE THAT IT WILL, AS INDICATED, BE 23
- PARTIALLY APPROVED AND ALSO THE NEGOTIATIONS WITH PHYSICIAN'S 24
- 25 REIMBURSEMENT SHOULD HAPPEN THAT THE FUND BALANCE, THE RESERVE



- 1 AT THE END OF '07/'08 IN THE DEPARTMENT WOULD BE ABOUT \$23
- 2 MILLION. SO THEY WOULD STILL BE POSITIVE EVEN IF WE LOST THE
- 3 MANAGED CARE RATE INCREASE, IN PART. AND NO GENERAL FUND
- 4 MONIES, THEREFORE, WOULD BE NEEDED.

5

6 SUP. ANTONOVICH: HOW LONG DOES IT REMAIN POSITIVE?

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: UNTIL THE NEXT YEAR AND THEN IT'S IN A DEFICIT
- 9 AGAIN, IN '08/'09.

10

- 11 SUP. ANTONOVICH: BUT KNOWING THAT YOU'D HAVE THAT DEFICIT THE
- 12 FOLLOWING YEAR, AREN'T THERE NOT STEPS TO BE TAKEN WITH THE
- 13 REJECTION FROM C.M.S.?

- 15 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, THE DEPARTMENT, A COUPLE OF THINGS. IN
- 16 SEPTEMBER, THE DEPARTMENT WILL HAVE AVAILABLE DURING
- 17 SUPPLEMENTAL DISCUSSIONS ABOUT POTENTIAL REDUCTIONS IN THE
- 18 DEPARTMENT. AND I CAN TELL YOU NOW, THE LIST IS NOT A LOT
- 19 DIFFERENT THAN IT WAS WHEN WE LOOKED AT IT IN 2002, THAT, IF
- 20 WE NEED TO MAKE REDUCTIONS, THEY'RE GOING TO BE REDUCTIONS IN
- 21 SERVICES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY. THE DEPARTMENT ITSELF HAS BEEN
- 22 AND IS WORKING TO THE EXTENT THAT THE DIRECTOR HAS TIME ON
- 23 SYSTEMIC SAVINGS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT AND THEY HAVE BEEN
- 24 MAKING PROGRESS IN REDUCING THE COST OF OPERATIONS OF THE



- 1 ENTIRE SYSTEM. SO IT'S A COMBINATION OF THOSE TWO THAT YOU
- 2 WILL BE DISCUSSING IN SEPTEMBER.

3

- 4 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE BUDGET INCLUDES 19 NEW D.H.S. H.R.
- 5 POSITIONS AND IT APPEARS THAT THERE'S NOW A TREND AMONG
- 6 DEPARTMENTS TO REQUEST H.R. POSITIONS. IS YOUR OFFICE TAKING A
- 7 COMPREHENSIVE LOOK AT THE LOOK AT THE EFFECT OF DECENTRALIZING
- 8 THE H.R. FUNCTION COUNTYWIDE? AND HOW HAS THE DECENTRALIZATION
- 9 OF H.R. FUNCTIONS IMPACTED THE COUNTY'S CENTRAL H.R.
- 10 DEPARTMENT?

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: LET ME ANSWER THAT THIS WAY. THE ADDITIONAL
- 13 POSITIONS THAT THEY ARE REQUESTING ARE FOR THEIR OWN WORKLOAD
- 14 PURPOSES. BUT, SECONDARILY, WE ARE GOING TO BE LOOKING AT
- 15 SPECIFICALLY THE WHOLE ISSUE OF SHARED SERVICES IN HUMAN
- 16 RESOURCES AS PART OF OUR OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS INITIATIVE.
- 17 AND, AS WE HAVE DONE IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AS WE HAVE
- 18 DONE IN FISCAL, WE WILL BE LOOKING AT THAT AS PART OF HUMAN
- 19 RESOURCES, AS WELL.

20

- 21 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHAT'S THE TOTAL AMOUNT IN COUNTY GENERAL
- 22 FUND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH BUDGET, INCLUDING ALL P.F.U.S
- 23 AND DESIGNATIONS?



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 700 MILLION COMES TO MIND IF YOU INCLUDE ALL
- 2 OF THE VARIOUS TOBACCO RESOURCES, GENERAL FUND. I THINK IT'S--
- 3 HERE, IT'S COMING. DARRILYN KNOWS. I'LL GIVE YOU AN EXACT
- 4 FIGURE IF WE HAVE ONE. I BELIEVE THERE'S ONLY 30 MILLION OF
- 5 ADDITIONAL GENERAL FUND THIS YEAR IN THE PROPOSED.
- 6 748,783,000.

7

8 SUP. ANTONOVICH: SAY 749 BASICALLY?

9

- 10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 453 MILLION OF THAT IS EITHER MAINTENANCE OF
- 11 EFFORT OR VEHICLE LICENSE FEES. SO THAT'S REQUIRED. SO THE NET
- 12 DIFFERENCE IS RIGHT AROUND 300 MILLION OF ACTUAL GENERAL FUND.

13

14 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHAT WAS IT LAST YEAR?

15

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT WAS, AS I SAID, I THINK WE'RE ONLY ADDING
- 17 30 MILLION IN GENERAL FUND? FOR THE PROPOSED BUDGET? SO IT
- 18 WOULD BE 718. ACTUALLY, IT'S IN FRONT OF ME. IT'S 692.

19

- 20 SUP. ANTONOVICH: IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET, L.A.C./U.S.C. WILL
- 21 TRANSFER THE OPERATION OF THE PSYCHIATRIC OUTPATIENT CLINIC TO
- 22 D.M.H. HOW DOES THAT IMPACT THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH'S
- 23 BUDGET?



- 1 ALAN WECKER: IT'S ALREADY AFFECTED IN THE FISCAL AND WE'RE
- 2 ASSUMING-- OH, SORRY. OH, HOW DOES IT AFFECT MENTAL HEALTH?

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE QUESTION WAS HOW DOES THE TRANSFER OF THE
- 5 PSYCH OUTPATIENT, WAS IT, SUPERVISOR? TO MENTAL HEALTH AFFECT
- 6 THE MENTAL HEALTH BUDGET. THAT'S NOT ANTICIPATED TO COME TO
- 7 YOU UNTIL THE FALL SO YOU HAVE NOT ACTUALLY TAKEN THAT ACTION
- 8 YET SO THERE IS NOT AN ASSUMPTION IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET.

9

- 10 SUP. ANTONOVICH: BUT DOES THAT IMPACT THE BUDGET THAT WE'D BE
- 11 APPROVING TODAY IF WE APPROVED IT TODAY?

12

13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO.

14

- 15 SUP. ANTONOVICH: NO. THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES
- 16 ESTIMATES AN ANNUAL SAVINGS OF \$1.2 MILLION DUE TO THE
- 17 TRANSFER OF PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL
- 18 HEALTH. WOULD THOSE PROJECTED SAVINGS SHIFT TO OUR COUNTY'S
- 19 EMERGENCY ROOMS?

20

- 21 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THEY'LL SHIFT TO THE DEPARTMENT,
- 22 SUPERVISOR, AS PART OF OUR ONGOING OPERATIONS, INCLUDING THE
- 23 EMERGENCY ROOMS.



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: BUT THE DEPARTMENT COULD SPEND THEM OUTSIDE
- 2 EMERGENCY ROOM NEEDS?

3

- 4 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WE WOULD USE THEM FOR OPERATIONS IN
- 5 GENERAL. THEY AREN'T EARMARKED TO GO TO ONE SPECIFIC PLACE.

6

- 7 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHY IS THERE A NET INCREASE IN COSTS IN
- 8 BUDGET POSITIONS DUE TO THE PATIENT FLOW MANAGEMENT PROGRAM?

9

- 10 ALAN WECKER: OKAY. WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO AT OUR HOSPITALS IS
- 11 WE'RE TRYING TO HIRE ADDITIONAL PEOPLE IN ORDER TO HELP US GET
- 12 THROUGH THE PATIENTS THROUGH THE SYSTEM. RIGHT NOW, WE'RE
- 13 GETTING-- THE STATE IS BASICALLY DOING A TAR PROCESS WHERE
- 14 THEY'RE TAKING A LOOK AT ALL OUR PATIENTS AND, IF THEY DON'T
- 15 THINK THEY'RE APPROPRIATE IN THE HOSPITAL, THEY WOULD GO AHEAD
- 16 AND DENY THE DAY AND NOT PAY IT. WHAT THESE PEOPLE ARE GOING
- 17 TO DO IS THEY'RE GOING TO HELP US IN MAKING SURE THAT WE DON'T
- 18 HAVE THIS PROBLEM, THAT THE PATIENTS ARE FLOWING THROUGH THE
- 19 SYSTEM. IT REDUCES OUR DENY DAY PROBLEM. SO WE THINK THAT,
- 20 ONCE THIS IS PUT INTO THE SYSTEM, THAT WE'LL BE ABLE TO HAVE
- 21 MORE REDUCTIONS IN OUR DENY DAYS THAT WE HAVE IN THE SYSTEM.

- 23 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: ONE ADDITIONAL POINT ON THAT, SUPERVISOR,
- 24 IS WE HAVE WORKED VERY HARD WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OVER THE
- 25 LAST YEAR TO DECREASE THE PERCENTAGE OF DENY DAYS. FROM MY



- 1 EXPERIENCE AWAY IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR AND NOW BACK IN THE
- 2 DEPARTMENT, THAT SEEMED LIKE A REAL OPPORTUNITY TO ME AND WE
- 3 HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS. AND WHAT IS NOW CLEAR TO ME IS
- 4 THAT, BASED ON THAT PROGRESS, A SMALL INVESTMENT OF ADDITIONAL
- 5 RESOURCES, STAFF THAT DO MORE TRADITIONAL UTILIZATION
- 6 MANAGEMENT IN A HOSPITAL SETTING TO MOVE PATIENTS THROUGH,
- 7 HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DECREASE THE NUMBER OF DENY DAYS EVEN
- 8 FURTHER, WHICH GENERATES REVENUE FOR THE DEPARTMENT, A DAY
- 9 THAT WE DON'T GET PAID FOR IS A DAY WE DON'T GET PAID FOR BUT
- 10 WE STILL HAVE ALL THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH IT. SO OUR GOAL IS
- 11 TO REALLY IMPROVE OUR REIMBURSEMENT PER BED PER DAY WHEREVER
- 12 POSSIBLE AND THAT'S WHERE THIS SPECIFIC INFUSION IS TARGETED
- 13 AND IT'S BASED ON OUR OWN EXPERIENCE TO DATE.

14

- 15 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WITH THE REDUCTION IN NURSE REGISTRIES, WHAT
- 16 ARE WE SAVING?

17

- 18 ALAN WECKER: WELL, I THINK WE'RE ANTICIPATING TO SAVE, OVER
- 19 FIVE YEARS, APPROXIMATELY \$30 MILLION BUT WE'RE HOPING NOW
- 20 WITH THE CURRENT INCREASE IN THE SALARIES THAT HAVE BEEN GIVEN
- 21 TO THE NURSES, WE'RE HOPING TO GET ADDITIONAL SAVINGS. WE'LL
- 22 HAVE MORE PEOPLE ON COUNTY STAFF AND USING THE REGISTRIES
- LESS.



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF MEDICAL REDESIGN ON
- 2 RECEIPT OF SECTION 1011 REIMBURSEMENTS AND CAN THE COUNTY
- 3 ACCEPT MEDI-CAL REDESIGN IN SECTION 1011 PAYMENTS?

4

- 5 ALAN WECKER: OUR LATEST REVIEW WITH OUR OUTSIDE ATTORNEYS, WE
- 6 DO BELIEVE THAT WE CAN ACCEPT BOTH 1011 FUNDS AND FUNDS
- 7 THROUGH MEDI-CAL REDESIGN.

8

- 9 SUP. ANTONOVICH: JUST TO GO BACK, DAVID, REGARDING THE
- 10 INTEROPERABILITY BUDGET ADJUSTMENT, YOU RECENTLY SENT US A
- 11 MEMO REGARDING THE USE OF SATELLITE FOR INTEROPERABILITY. HOW
- 12 DOES THE COST OF SATELLITE SYSTEM COMPARE TO USING LAND LINES
- 13 OR RADIOS FOR INTEROPERABILITY?

14

- 15 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I REMEMBER SIGNING THE MEMO. I DON'T REMEMBER
- 16 WHAT IT SAID. CAN WE REPORT BACK TO YOU ON THAT, SUPERVISOR?

17

- 18 SUP. ANTONOVICH: RIGHT, IT'S A REPORT BACK BUT JUST FOR THAT
- 19 COST, SO WE'D BE ABLE TO HAVE A FIGURE TO NEGOTIATE WITH OUR
- 20 CITIES AND OTHER COUNTIES.

21

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. THIS WAS PART OF THE SHERIFF FIRE RADIO
- 23 PROJECT, RIGHT.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YEAH, WE'RE NOT THERE, WE'RE NOT
- 2 AT THAT POINT YET.

3

- 4 SUP. ANTONOVICH: NO, NO. THAT WAS ITEM 1. I KNOW. I JUST WENT
- 5 BACK TO IT.

6

- 7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OH, RIGHT. THAT WAS-- YEAH. THERE IS A PIECE,
- 8 YES.

9

10 SUP. ANTONOVICH: COULD WE GET SOME HARD FIGURES SO WE KNOW?

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. WE'LL WORK WITH OUR CONSULTANT AND GET
- 13 YOU SOMETHING.

14

- 15 SUP. ANTONOVICH: REGARDING THE 1.5 MILLION TRANSFER OF FUNDS
- 16 FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES, SPECIAL
- 17 PROGRAMS TO THE ASSISTANT'S BUDGET, DID WE FIND OUT WHAT THE
- 18 HIGHER-- WHAT ARE THE HIGHER THAN ANTICIPATED COSTS PER CASE
- 19 FOR A.F.D.C. FOSTER CARE?

20

- 21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE CAN LET YOU KNOW WHAT THAT IS. I'M JUST
- 22 SEEING IF TRISH WAS HERE, SHE WOULD KNOW BUT, IF NOT, WE'LL
- 23 GET BACK TO YOU ON THAT TODAY.

24

25 SUP. ANTONOVICH: OKAY, THANK YOU.

3

11

13

16

21

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1
2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. MS. MOLINA?

4 SUP. MOLINA: ON THE ISSUE OF THE PSYCH PATIENTS, I WANT TO

- 5 UNDERSTAND IT. SO IN THE BUDGET WHEN IT'S NOTED THERE, DAVID,
- 6 THAT INCLUSION IS DEFICIT PLAN ACTIONS INTO THE FINAL CHANGE
- 7 BUDGET, YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THAT, IN SEPTEMBER IS WHEN YOU'RE
- 8 GOING TO ACTUALLY-- WE'RE NOT GOING TO VOTE ON THAT TRANSFER
- 9 AS OF YET FOR MENTAL HEALTH TO DEAL WITH THE OUTPATIENT MENTAL
- 10 HEALTH-- PSYCH, IS THAT CORRECT?

12 ALAN WECKER: YES.

14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES. THAT WILL BE A DISCUSSION YOU'LL HAVE

15 ABOUT SEPTEMBER.

17 SUP. MOLINA: SO IT'S IN HERE AND IT'S A LITTLE OVER 1 MILLION,

- 18 WELL, 1 MILLION INITIALLY AND THEN 1.2 AS IT GOES THROUGH. SO
- 19 I KNOW THAT YOU SPEND MORE THAN THAT IN OUTPATIENT SERVICES
- 20 NOW, DON'T YOU?
- 22 ALAN WECKER: WHAT YOU'RE LOOKING AT IS REALLY THE NET COST.
- 23 IT'S OUR VARIABLE COST LESS ANY REVENUES THAT WE GET FROM THE
- 24 DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND IT'S 1.2 MILLION. AND THIS IS
- 25 ONLY AT L.A.C./ U.S.C. MEDICAL CENTER OUTPATIENT.



1

2 SUP. MOLINA: RIGHT. AND THIS IS THE NET COST.

3

4 ALAN WECKER: NET COST.

5

- 6 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. SO WE NOTED THAT AND WE'RE CONCERNED
- 7 ABOUT IT. I KNOW THAT YOU'VE BEEN NEGOTIATING WITH THE
- 8 DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AS TO HOW YOU'RE GOING TO MOVE
- 9 FORWARD ON THAT. AND THERE ISN'T-- WE HAVEN'T SEEN A PLAN AS
- 10 YET. SO I TAKE IT THAT, IN SEPTEMBER, YOU'RE GOING TO BRING US
- 11 A PLAN AS TO HOW THAT IS GOING TO WORK, IS THAT CORRECT?

12

13 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: YES, IT IS, SUPERVISOR.

14

- 15 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. BUT, AT THE SAME TIME, I'M TRYING TO
- 16 UNDERSTAND THERE WAS SOME DISCUSSION EARLIER THAT THERE WAS
- 17 ALSO GOING TO BE A TRANSFER, I DON'T KNOW TO WHO, OF THE PSYCH
- 18 E.R.S.

19

- 20 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, AT THIS POINT WITH THE HELP OF
- 21 THE C.A.O.'S OFFICE, WE-- MY DEPARTMENT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF
- 22 MENTAL HEALTH ARE REALLY LOOKING CLOSELY AT THE ENTIRE SET OF
- 23 SERVICES WE'RE OPERATING, INPATIENT...

24

25 SUP. MOLINA: YOU MEAN MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES?



1

- 2 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES. SO WE'RE LOOKING AT
- 3 INPATIENT SERVICES, EMERGENCY ROOM SERVICES, OPERATING ROOM
- 4 SERVICES, TO COME FORWARD TO YOUR BOARD WITH A MORE KIND OF
- 5 THOUGHTFUL AND COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH ABOUT HOW WE DELIVER
- 6 MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES, GIVEN THE TOUGH FINANCIAL POSITIONS
- 7 THAT BOTH DEPARTMENTS ARE IN. SO WE HAVE NOT MADE ANY
- 8 DECISIONS ABOUT THE PSYCH E.R. AT THIS POINT AND WE WILL BRING
- 9 FORWARD A FULL PROPOSAL THAT LOOKS AT THOSE SERVICES AS WELL
- 10 AS INPATIENT AND OTHER SERVICES IN THIS POST M.H.S.A. PERIOD
- 11 WE'RE IN WHERE D.M.H. HAS ADDITIONAL FUNDINGS TO DO OTHER
- 12 KINDS OF PROGRAMMATIC THINGS. WE'RE TRYING TO COME FORWARD
- 13 WITH A THOUGHTFUL PROPOSAL THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT WHERE WE
- 14 ARE.

15

- 16 SUP. MOLINA: AND YOU'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO PRESENT THAT TO US
- 17 BY SEPTEMBER?

18

19 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WE'RE DOING THIS IN...

20

21 SUP. MOLINA: WELL, SEE, THAT'S WHAT I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND.

22

23 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: I APOLOGIZE.



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I THINK THE OUTPATIENT, SUPERVISOR, AT L.A.C./
- 2 U.S.C. IS SCHEDULED TO BE DISCUSSED IN THE FALL. THE WHOLE
- 3 ISSUE, I THINK, WE'RE LOOKING AT JANUARY.

4

5 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: I STAND CORRECTED. I APOLOGIZE.

6

- 7 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. WELL, WE ARE UNINFORMED AS TO WHERE WE
- 8 ARE, WHERE YOU ALL ARE. WE KNOW THERE ARE DISCUSSIONS. WE ALL
- 9 KNOW THAT IT WAS EVEN PUT KIND OF IN THE ORIGINAL BUDGET OR
- 10 THE PREVIOUS BUDGET AND THEN REMOVED AND WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT
- 11 THAT BECAUSE WE WANT TO UNDERSTAND IT IN FULL CONTEXT AS TO
- 12 EXACTLY WHAT YOU'RE GOING TO DO. AND, AGAIN, AS I UNDERSTAND,
- 13 THAT ONLY INCLUDES AT THIS POINT IN TIME L.A. COUNTY U.S.C.,
- 14 IS THAT CORRECT?

15

16 ALAN WECKER: YES.

17

- 18 SUP. MOLINA: WE USED TO HAVE PSYCHIATRIC, I THINK, E.R. AT
- 19 M.L.K. DID WE HAVE IT AT HARPER?

20

- 21 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WE CURRENTLY RUN PSYCHIATRIC EMERGENCY
- 22 ROOM, SUPERVISOR, AT L.A. COUNTY U.S.C., AT HARBOR U.C.L.A.
- 23 AND AT OLIVE VIEW.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: OKAY. SO THE PLANS FOR THOSE CHANGES ARE ONLY AT
- 2 L.A. COUNTY U.S.C., IS THAT CORRECT?

3

- 4 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WE HAVE MADE NO FINAL DECISIONS ABOUT
- 5 CHANGES IN ANY SCOPE OF SERVICE AT THIS POINT AT ANY OF THE
- 6 FACILITIES, SUPERVISOR. WE'RE STILL WORKING WITH D.M.H.

7

- 8 SUP. MOLINA: AND ARE YOU TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE HARRIS ROAD
- 9 RESPONSIBILITIES...

10

- 11 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: OF COURSE, SUPERVISOR. ABSOLUTELY,
- 12 SUPERVISOR.

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: ...THAT WE HAVE IN THAT AREA? OKAY. WELL, I KNOW
- 15 THAT THERE'S BEEN DISCUSSION AND I JUST KNOW THERE ARE VARIOUS
- 16 POLICY ISSUES THAT ARE GOING TO BE RELATED TO IT. I DON'T
- 17 WANT, IN SEPTEMBER, IT TO BE KNOWN JUST AS A MONEY ISSUE AND
- 18 I'M NOT SO SURE I EVEN UNDERSTAND THE MONEY ASPECT OF IT. I'D
- 19 LIKE A PRESENTATION. SO I'M PUTTING IN A MOTION AND MY STAFF
- 20 HAS A MOTION TO PUT IN ON THIS THAT WE ASK BOTH THE DEPARTMENT
- 21 OF HEALTH SERVICES AS WELL AS THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
- 22 TO PRESENT A FULL REPORT TO US IN 30 DAYS. NOW, I'M ASKING, AT
- 23 LEAST WHAT YOU'RE DISCUSSING WHAT SOME OF THE ISSUES ARE, WHAT
- 24 THE STATUS REPORT IS AND THAT BEING THE FINANCIAL BUT THE HOW
- 25 TO. HOW ARE YOU DOING IT? WHERE ARE YOU DOING IT? WHERE IS IT



- 1 GOING TO GO? HOW IS IT GOING TO WORK? AND WHO WILL BE
- 2 RESPONSIBLE FOR IT? AND WE JUST NEED TO KNOW WHAT THE CURRENT
- 3 STATUS IS OF OUR PSYCH E.R.S IN ALL OF OUR FACILITIES. WE KNOW
- 4 IT'S A PROBLEM BUT I DON'T KNOW HOW IT'S BEING ADDRESSED. AND
- 5 WE HAVE-- CERTAINLY, WE'RE CONCERNED WHEN I DID SEE IT AT
- 6 M.L.K. AND IT CONTINUES TO BE A PROBLEM AT L.A. COUNTY U.S.C.
- 7 SO WE NEED TO REPORT. WE NEED THE POLICY ISSUES RAISED. WE
- 8 NEED A COMPLETE UNDERSTANDING OF WHERE AND HOW THE MONEY IS
- 9 GOING TO WORK, WHAT IS GOING TO BE MENTAL HEALTH'S
- 10 RESPONSIBILITY FINANCIALLY, WHAT IS GOING TO BE THE HEALTH
- 11 DEPARTMENT FINANCIALLY. WHETHER IT IS A REDUCTION, WHETHER
- 12 WE'RE GOING TO-- IF IT'S GOING TO BE OUTPATIENT OR HOWEVER
- 13 YOU'RE GOING TO DO IT. WE NEED TO HAVE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING.
- 14 I KNOW I DON'T UNDERSTAND IT VERY WELL AND I THINK THAT IT
- 15 WOULD BE-- THERE ARE POLICY ISSUES THAT WE SHOULD DETERMINE AS
- 16 TO WHAT WE WANT TO DO AND, UNFORTUNATELY, IT'S AN ESCALATING
- 17 NEED THROUGHOUT THE COMMUNITY. ON THE OTHER ISSUE, I WANT TO
- 18 UNDERSTAND, BECAUSE IT CERTAINLY IS VERY DIFFERENT THAN WHAT
- 19 WAS PRESENTED ORIGINALLY UNDER OUR METROCARE. UNDER METROCARE
- 20 AND THE SAVINGS THIS TIME, AS YOU ALL NOTED IN THE BUDGET, IS
- 21 ALMOST \$50 MILLION IN SAVINGS. WE HAD PROPOSED THIS MONEY THAT
- 22 WOULD BE UTILIZED IN TRYING TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS OF METROCARE
- 23 BUT WE HAVE SAVINGS. AND WHEN YOU POINT TO THE SAVINGS,
- 24 BASICALLY, I THINK POINTS TO ONE OF THE PROBLEMS THAT WE'RE
- 25 FACING NOW. CERTAINLY I, AND PROBABLY OTHERS ON THIS SIDE OF



- 1 THE TABLE, WERE OF THE EXPECTATION THAT EVERYONE THERE WOULD
- 2 BE TERMINATED, IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER, AND THAT THEY WOULD BE
- 3 REINTERVIEWED TO SEE WHO WOULD BE INCLUDED IN, QUOTE, THE NEW
- 4 METROCARE MODEL. AND THE IDEA WAS THAT, MORE THAN LIKELY, WE
- 5 WOULD SEE A GOOD DEAL OF THE STAFF MOVING ON TO DIFFERENT
- 6 POSITIONS. THEY WOULD EITHER GO TO OTHER FACILITIES, SINCE WE
- 7 WOULDN'T BE TERMINATING ANYONE, THEY'D GO TO OTHER FACILITIES
- 8 AND FILL THOSE VACANCIES, AS WE HAD ENOUGH VACANCIES, AS YOU
- 9 MENTIONED, TO US, TO AT LEAST ABSORB THEM AT ALL THE OTHER
- 10 FACILITIES BUT THEY WOULD BE INTERVIEWED THERE AND CERTAINLY
- 11 WOULD HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO MAINTAIN THE SAME LEVEL OF
- 12 QUALITY THAT WAS AT THOSE PARTICULAR FACILITIES. BUT, AT THE
- 13 END OF THE DAY, IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT ONLY 20 PERCENT OF
- 14 THEM ACTUALLY DID LEAVE.

15

- 16 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, THE 391 THAT MR. WECKER
- 17 REFERRED TO SIMPLY REFLECTS CHANGES THAT WERE MADE BETWEEN THE
- 18 PROPOSED BUDGET AND FINAL CHANGES. LET ME WALK THROUGH WITH
- 19 YOU ALL OF THE H.R. CHANGES THAT HAVE OCCURRED. THERE ARE 250
- 20 RESIDENT AND INTERN POSITIONS THAT ARE GONE. 174 PSYCH
- 21 POSITIONS. 20 OTHER POSITIONS. THOSE WERE ALL NOTED, THAT 444
- 22 WAS ALL NOTED IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET. IN THE FINAL CHANGES...

- 24 SUP. BURKE: PARDON ME, I DIDN'T GET-- WHAT WERE THE PSYCH
- 25 POSITIONS, HOW MANY WERE THERE?



1

- 2 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: 174. IN THE FINAL CHANGES, THERE'S BEEN AN
- 3 ADDITIONAL 391 POSITIONS RELATED TO THE INTERVIEW AND
- 4 RESTAFFING BASED ON-- LET ME REITERATE, SUPERVISOR, THAT EVERY
- 5 SINGLE EMPLOYEE WAS INTERVIEWED AND THEN A SELECTION WAS MADE,
- 6 BASED ON FILE REVIEW AS WELL AS THE INTERVIEW ITSELF. WITH
- 7 RESPECT TO THOSE FOLKS, MOST QUALIFIED TO HELP US WORK THROUGH
- 8 THE NEW MODEL. SO THERE IS THAT 391 AND THEN THERE'S ANOTHER
- 9 287 POSITIONS WHICH WERE BUDGETED BUT VACANT AT THE TIME THAT
- 10 HAVE ATTRITTED. SO, SINCE WE HAVE BEGUN METROCARE, THE TOTAL
- 11 NUMBER OF POSITIONS THAT HAVE LEFT THE FACILITY IS 1,122
- 12 POSITIONS.

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: 70 PERCENT OF THE FORMER EMPLOYEES ARE STILL AT
- 15 M.L.K. SHARE WITH ME HOW YOU WENT THROUGH THAT PROCESS OF
- 16 SELECTION. WERE THE HARPER DOCS AND ADMINISTRATORS INVOLVED IN
- 17 THAT SELECTION PROCESS?

- 19 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: YES, THEY WERE, SUPERVISOR. LET ME GO
- 20 THROUGH THE PROCESS FOR YOU. FIRST, LET ME BEGIN BY SAYING
- 21 THAT OUR SPECIFIC FOCUS WAS THE HOSPITAL ITSELF. WE DELIVER AN
- 22 ENORMOUS NUMBER OF OUTPATIENT VISITS AT THE FACILITY, IN THE
- 23 SPECIALTY AND PRIMARY CARE CLINICS. THOSE INDIVIDUALS WERE NOT
- 24 INTERVIEWED. THAT BODY OF WORK IS A SECOND BODY OF WORK THAT
- 25 WAS NOT DONE BECAUSE THIS WAS...



1
2 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT, SO LET'S START WITH THE NUMBER.

3

4 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SO JUST FOCUSING...

5

- 6 SUP. MOLINA: WAIT, WAIT, WAIT. YOU'RE BLENDING THEM.
- 7 OUTPATIENT HAS HOW MANY EMPLOYEES? SINCE THOSE ARE THE PEOPLE
- 8 THAT WERE NOT INTERVIEWED.

9

10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE'LL GET THAT. WE DON'T HAVE IT RIGHT NOW.

11

- 12 SUP. MOLINA: OKAY. SO THE FIRST NUMBER THAT YOU DID SAY, OKAY,
- 13 HOW MANY DID THE HOSPITAL HAVE?

14

- 15 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, I NEED TO GET YOU THE SPLIT
- 16 BETWEEN-- I DON'T HAVE IT WITH ME TODAY, SUPERVISOR, BUT WE'LL
- 17 GET YOU...

18

- 19 SUP. MOLINA: WELL, WE KNOW HOW MANY EMPLOYEES, I MEAN, AT THE
- 20 HOSPITAL.

- 22 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THE HOSPITAL HAS A STAFFING THAT'S BOTH--
- 23 IT'S OUTPATIENT AND IT'S INPATIENT SERVICES AND WHAT I DON'T
- 24 HAVE FOR YOU OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD IS THE EXACT NUMBER OF
- 25 INPATIENT ONLY POSITIONS THAT WE INTERVIEWED BUT I CAN...

24

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: DID THE LION'S SHARE OF THE... 3 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THE LION'S SHARE OF POSITIONS ARE ACTUALLY 4 5 OUT... 6 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THE LION'S SHARE OF THE POSITIONS 8 THAT DISAPPEARED OR THAT WERE REMOVED, PEOPLE WHO WERE MOVED WERE FOR INPATIENT? 10 11 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THEY WERE ALL INPATIENT. 12 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL INPATIENT. AND HOW MANY, IF I COULD JUST -- BECAUSE I THINK SPECIFICITY IS WHAT WE'RE LOOKING 14 FOR. OVERALL AT THE HOSPITAL, WHAT IS THE SCORE CARD? HOW MANY 15 16 WERE REMOVED? HOW MANY WERE REASSIGNED? 17 18 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: OKAY. THE TOTAL NUMBER OF POSITIONS, OF 19 POSITIONS THAT HAVE DISAPPEARED IS 1,122. 20 SUP. KNABE: WERE THOSE FILLED POSITIONS? FILLED? 21 22 23 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: 287 OF THOSE, SUPERVISOR, WERE UNFILLED

POSITIONS, THEY WERE BUDGETED BUT UNFILLED. THE REMAINDER WERE

ALL FILLED IN ONE FORM OR ANOTHER.

24

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: 1,122? 2 3 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: CORRECT. 4 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND HOW MANY WERE UNFILLED, YOU 6 7 SAID? 8 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: 287, SUPERVISOR. 10 11 SUP. KNABE: WAS THERE ANY CASCADING AS A RESULT OF THIS? 12 13 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, THERE WAS NO CASCADING. THERE WAS THE MITIGATIONS THAT YOUR BOARD APPROVED WHERE WE HAD 14 EMPLOYEES BE PLACED ON OTHER OPEN VACANT ITEMS IN MY 15 16 ORGANIZATION. 17 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND HOW BIG WAS THE-- WHEN YOU SAY 19 1,122 POSITIONS DISAPPEARED OUT OF A TOTAL OF HOW MANY? 20 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WE STARTED WITH-- IF YOU INCLUDE THE 21 22 BUDGETED BUT UNFILLED POSITIONS, IT WAS 3,188 WAS WHAT WAS ON 23 THE ITEM CONTROL WHEN WE STARTED.



- 1 SUP. BURKE: BUT HOW MANY NEW PEOPLE CAME IN? THAT'S REALLY THE
- 2 ISSUE.

3

- 4 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, I WILL HAVE TO GET YOU THAT
- 5 NUMBER.

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE: THAT REALLY GETS THE CRUX OF THE ISSUE. HOW MANY
- 8 NEW PEOPLE FROM OTHER FACILITIES WERE HIRED TO COME INTO THE
- 9 HOSPITAL?

10

- 11 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, I DON'T HAVE THAT NUMBER WITH
- 12 ME. IT'S NOT A LARGE NUMBER.

13

- 14 SUP. BURKE: I'M AWARE IT'S NOT A LARGE NUMBER. THAT'S THE
- 15 PROBLEM.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IS THE 1,122 A NET FIGURE? IS THE
- 1,122 A NET FIGURE? YOU SAY 1,122 DISAPPEARED...

19

20 ALAN WECKER: YES.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO IF THERE WERE PEOPLE WHO CAME
- 23 IN FROM ELSEWHERE THAT'S ALREADY...



- 1 ALAN WECKER: YEAH, I'M SORRY, THESE ARE JUST POSITIONS. THESE
- 2 AREN'T ACTUAL PEOPLE. WHAT YOU'RE SEEING...

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MOST OF THEM ARE PEOPLE, THOUGH.
- 5 ABOUT 80 PERCENT OF THEM, 75 PERCENT OF THEM.

6

7 ALAN WECKER: 80 PERCENT OF THEM, YES.

8

- 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO IS THIS A NET FIGURE? OR IS
- 10 WHAT MRS. BURKE TALKING ABOUT...

11

12 SUP. BURKE: WELL...

13

- 14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: HANG ON, HANG ON, NO, NO,
- 15 NO...

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE: YOU HAVE TO TAKE OUT THE RESIDENTS, WHICH IS 250.
- 18 YOU TAKE OUT 287 THAT IS THE BUDGETED OR VACANT, SO YOU'RE
- 19 DOWN TO ALMOST 500.

20

21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I JUST WANTED TO GET A...

22

23 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: IT'S NOT A NET FIGURE.

24

25 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IT'S NOT A NET FIGURE.



2 ALAN WECKER: NO, IT IS NOT.

3

1

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. SO CAN YOU GET US A NET
- 5 FIGURE? YOU DON'T KNOW IT NOW? MS. BURKE, MS. MOLINA?

6

7 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: CERTAINLY. NO.

- 9 SUP. MOLINA: SINCE I-- WHAT I NEED IS THIS. TOMORROW, WE'RE
- 10 GOING TO DISCUSS THIS. YOU NEED TO GIVE US A CHART. WE, I
- 11 MEAN, I AM CERTAINLY ONE AND OTHERS MAY OR MAY NOT, I WAS
- 12 UNDER THE IMPRESSION THAT THIS WOULD BE A VERY RIGOROUS
- 13 PROCESS, THAT WE WERE TALKING ABOUT REVAMPING THE ENTIRE
- 14 HOSPITAL, BRINGING IN QUALITY AND THE CALIBER OF PEOPLE THAT
- 15 COULD REALLY TAKE US THROUGH THIS NEW REEXAMINATION, THAT
- 16 THERE WOULD BE AN OVERSIGHT AND SUPERVISION OF HARBOR, WHETHER
- 17 WE WERE TOLD EXACTLY HOW IT WAS GOING TO OPERATE OR NOT. THIS
- 18 WAS CERTAINLY OUR IMPRESSION THAT THAT WAS THE CASE. SO HERE'S
- 19 WHAT I NEED FOR TOMORROW BECAUSE YOU HAVE THE NUMBERS.
- 20 SOMEBODY JUST HAS TO GO AND DO A SPREADSHEET FOR US. WE NEED
- 21 TO FIND OUT HOW MANY EMPLOYEES WERE AT "M.L.K." AND THEN YOU
- 22 NEED TO BREAK IT OUT BUY OUT PATIENT AND HOSPITAL. AND YOU
- 23 NEED TO BREAK IT DOWN BY RESIDENTS BECAUSE YOU REALLY NEED TO
- 24 REMOVE THOSE COMPLETELY BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT WE ENDED AS WELL.
- 25 AND THEN YOU NEED TO LET US KNOW UNDER "THE NEW METROCARE



- 1 MODEL", THEN YOU NEED TO LET US KNOW HOW MANY EMPLOYEES AND
- 2 I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT THE HARBOR SIDE OF IT. I'M TALKING ABOUT
- 3 THE M.L.K. SIDE OF IT. HOW MANY EMPLOYEES ARE THERE FOR THE
- 4 OUTPATIENT? AND HOW MANY OF THOSE OUTPATIENT DID YOU
- 5 INTERVIEW? DID YOU BRING IN? DID YOU DO OR NOT TOUCH AT ALL?
- 6 AND HOW MANY WERE LEFT? AND HOW MANY CAME? STAYED? AND HOW
- 7 MANY NEW PEOPLE WERE ADDED? THEN YOU HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE
- 8 HOSPITAL AND YOU HAVE TO TELL US HOW MANY PEOPLE WERE
- 9 REVIEWED, INTERVIEWED? HOW MANY PEOPLE LEFT TO OTHER
- 10 POSITIONS? AND HOW MANY PEOPLE ACTUALLY STAYED AFTER THE
- 11 INTERVIEWS? AND THEN YOU NEED TO LET US KNOW HOW MANY NEW
- 12 PEOPLE CAME IN FROM THIS INTERVIEW PROCESS. AND I NEED TO KNOW
- 13 WHO, AT HARBOR, WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR PART OF THAT INTERVIEW
- 14 PROCESS, PARTICULARLY FOR THE HOSPITAL.

15

- 16 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, WE'LL BE GLAD TO PROVIDE THAT
- 17 INFORMATION TO YOU TOMORROW BUT THE APPROPRIATE INDIVIDUALS AT
- 18 HARBOR INTERVIEWED. SO DEPARTMENT HEADS INTERVIEWED ALL THE
- 19 STAFF...

20

- 21 SUP. MOLINA: I DON'T CARE WHO THE APPROPRIATE INDIVIDUALS ARE.
- 22 I NEED TO KNOW WHO THEY ARE.

23

24 SUP. BURKE: WASN'T IT BY DEPARTMENT?



- DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: IT WAS BY DEPARTMENT AND BY FUNCTIONAL
- 2 AREA.

3

4 SUP. MOLINA: I KNOW BUT I NEED TO KNOW WHO THEY ARE.

5

- 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHAT WERE YOU GOING TO SAY,
- 7 THOUGH? YOU WERE IN THE MIDDLE OF SAYING SOMETHING. WOULD YOU
- 8 FINISH YOUR SENTENCE? WELL, I'D LIKE TO KNOW WHAT IT WAS YOU
- 9 WERE ABOUT TO SAY.

10

- 11 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THERE WAS A INCREDIBLY THOROUGH-- I MEAN,
- 12 I'D BE GLAD TO BRING THIS DATA FORWARD. I THINK THAT'S A--
- 13 GLAD TO DO THAT. THERE WAS AN INCREDIBLY THOROUGH INTERVIEW
- 14 PROCESS WHERE EVERY SINGLE DEPARTMENT HEAD INTERVIEWED ALL THE
- 15 PHYSICIANS IN THE PHYSICIAN AREA. EVERY SINGLE NURSE, BY
- 16 FUNCTIONAL AREA, WAS INTERVIEWED BY HARBOR NURSES. FOR ALL OF
- 17 THE OTHER STAFF PEOPLE IN THE CRAFTS AND TRADES, SUPPORT
- 18 SERVICES HAD FACE TO FACE INTERVIEWS BY HARBOR STAFF. IT WAS
- 19 AN INCREDIBLY-- ON THE HOSPITAL SIDE. ON THE HOSPITAL SIDE.
- 20 BECAUSE OUR FOCUS WAS NOT ON OUTPATIENT SERVICES TO BEGIN
- 21 WITH. SO IT WAS A VERY THOROUGH PROCESS AND I'M GLAD TO BRING
- 22 THE DATA FORWARD.

- 24 SUP. BURKE: MR. CHAIRMAN, I THINK THAT ONE THING WE HAVE--
- 25 WHERE IT SEEMS TO ME THE BREAKDOWN IN TERMS OF WHAT WAS



- 1 REPRESENTED TO ME AND WHAT HAPPENED-- AND PROBABLY FOR GOOD
- 2 REASON IT WAS CHANGED. BUT I WAS TOLD THAT ALL THE STAFF WOULD
- 3 GO TO HARBOR. THEY WOULD BE TRAINED THERE AND THEN THEY WOULD
- 4 RETURN TO M.L.K.-HARBOR. AND I UNDERSTAND-- AND THEN THE FIRST
- 5 RESPONSE I RECEIVED ON THAT WAS THAT MOST OF THOSE PEOPLE WHO
- 6 WENT TO HARBOR AND CAME BACK, FIRST OF ALL, HARBOR SAID THEY
- 7 DID NEED THE TRAINING AND THAT THEY WERE VERY EXCITED ABOUT
- 8 GETTING THIS KIND OF TRAINING. AND THAT, WHEN THEY WENT BACK,
- 9 THAT THEY WERE VERY-- FELT THAT THEY HAD IMPROVED THEIR
- 10 SKILLS. BUT, SOMEWHERE ALONG THE LINE, THAT PROCESS THAT HAD
- 11 BEEN EXPLAINED TO US, I GUESS IT WAS EXPLAINED TO ALL OF US,
- 12 IT WAS EXPLAINED TO ME, NO LONGER TOOK PLACE AND THAT'S WHAT I
- 13 WANT TO REALLY UNDERSTAND.

- 15 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, THE PROCESS CHANGED. THE
- 16 TRAINING PROCESS DID NOT CHANGE BUT THE LOCATION DID AND THE
- 17 REASON IS VERY SIMPLE. WHEN WE WENT THROUGH THE INTERVIEW
- 18 PROCESS, WHAT BECAME CLEAR TO US IS THAT OUR GOAL, AS WAS
- 19 WRITTEN IN THE PLAN, IS TO KEEP ABSOLUTELY THE BEST
- 20 INDIVIDUALS, MOST CAPABLE OF DOING THE WORK AND TO DECREASE
- 21 THE AMOUNT OF CONTRACT AND REGISTRY STAFF TO THE GREATEST
- 22 DEGREE POSSIBLE AND TO BE ABLE TO-- BECAUSE WE WANTED
- 23 ABSOLUTELY THE BEST PEOPLE. AND THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT, TO
- 24 PICK THE BEST PEOPLE, THERE WAS NOT ENOUGH REDUNDANT STAFF TO
- 25 RUN THE HOSPITAL AND SEND INDIVIDUALS OVER FOR EXTENDED



- 1 PERIODS OF TIME TO BE TRAINED AT HARBOR. SO THE DECISION WAS
- 2 MADE TO HAVE THE HARBOR INDIVIDUALS COME AND TRAIN ON SITE AND
- 3 THAT HAS BEEN HOW WE'VE APPROACHED ALL THE COMPETENCY
- 4 TRAINING, ALL THE TESTING HAS BEEN DONE ON SITE. WE'VE HAD
- 5 ENORMOUS NUMBERS OF RESOURCES ON SITE AT THE FACILITY FROM
- 6 HARBOR. THEIR ENTIRE NURSING EDUCATION PROGRAM HAS LITERALLY
- 7 MOVED IN AND SET UP SHOP AND...

8

9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHEN WAS THAT DECISION MADE?

10

- 11 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: AS WE STARTED, AS WE COMPLETED THE
- 12 INTERVIEWS IN-- WHEN DID WE DO THE MITIGATIONS? THE VERY END
- 13 OF FEBRUARY, EARLY MARCH.

- 15 SUP. BURKE: AND YOU KNOW WHAT THE PROBLEM WITH THAT IS? WHEN
- 16 THEY WENT TO HARBOR, THEY FOUND OUT THE ATTITUDE PEOPLE HAD
- 17 THERE AND I'VE-- I'M SHARING THIS WITH PATIENTS WHO CAME FROM
- 18 M.L.K. EMERGENCY ROOM AND WENT RIGHT TO HARBOR. THE ATTITUDE
- 19 THERE, THE WHOLE ATMOSPHERE, THE WAY THE PLACE LOOKED,
- 20 EVERYTHING WAS TOTALLY DIFFERENT. AND IF THEY HAD HAD AN
- 21 OPPORTUNITY TO GO INTO THAT SETTING, THEY WOULD HAVE HAD A
- 22 CHANCE TO FIND OUT HOW IT WORKED AND ALSO ALL OF THE THINGS
- 23 THAT MADE UP THE DIFFERENCE IN TERMS OF EFFICIENCY. AND THAT'S
- 24 WHY I THINK THAT THAT-- WHEN WE MADE THAT DECISION, IT REALLY



- 1 HAD AN IMPACT IN TERMS OF THE ABILITY OF THE STAFF TO ADJUST
- 2 TO A DIFFERENT MODE AND THAT'S WHAT REALLY CONCERNS ME.

- 4 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WELL, SUPERVISOR, I THINK IT'S A FAIR
- 5 CONCERN BUT THE REALITY IS THAT WE NEEDED TO CONTINUE TO
- 6 OPERATE A HOSPITAL. IN AN IDEAL WORLD, YOU'D CLOSE A HOSPITAL,
- 7 YOU COULD SEND EVERYBODY OFF AND RETRAIN THEM AND START AGAIN.
- 8 BUT THE PRACTICAL REALITY IS IS WE HAD A HOSPITAL WITH A 48-
- 9 BED FOOTPRINT AND A HOSPITAL THAT'S DELIVERING 35,000 E.R.
- 10 VISITS AND MAYBE ANOTHER 10 TO 12,000 URGENT CARE VISITS AND
- 11 THE GOAL WAS TO HAVE ABSOLUTELY THE BEST PEOPLE AVAILABLE TO
- 12 DELIVER THOSE SERVICES AND NOT TO KEEP ANYBODY AROUND,
- 13 CONTRACT OR OTHERWISE, WHO COULDN'T SUPPORT THAT EFFORT. AND
- 14 THE PLAN HAD TO ADJUST OVER TIME, BASED ON THE RESULTS OF THE
- 15 INTERVIEWS AND PEOPLE'S ACTUAL SKILLS ON THE GROUND. ONE OF
- 16 THE THINGS THAT WE'VE DONE THAT IS PROFOUNDLY DIFFERENT THAN
- 17 ALL THE OTHER WORK THAT HAS GONE ON TO DATE IS, WITH ALL THE
- 18 OTHER FOLKS YOU BROUGHT IN, THERE'S BEEN LOTS OF TRAINING AND
- 19 TESTING AND WHATNOT BUT THE NOTION THAT YOU GO BACK TO BASICS
- 20 WITH FOLKS WHO HAVE WORKED FOR LONG PERIODS OF TIME, IN SOME
- 21 CASES, IN THEIR ROLES, GO BACK TO BASICS AND HAVE THEM NOT
- 22 JUST SORT OF BE TRAINED AND THEN REPEAT, "HOW WOULD YOU DO THE
- 23 FOLLOWING?" BUT TO ACTUALLY DEMONSTRATE THOSE SKILLS. AND, FOR
- 24 EVERY EMPLOYEE TO HAVE THAT KIND OF INTERVENTION AND TO TRAIN
- 25 ON POLICIES AND PROCEDURES IN A HANDS-ON WAY, THE INVESTMENT



OF RESOURCES REALLY HAD BEEN DONE BY NO OTHER INTERVENTION 1 PRIOR TO THIS. AND, FRANKLY, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN IMPOSSIBLE TO 2 3 DO THAT WITH AN INPATIENT APPROACHING 200. 4 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: CAN I JUST ASK YOU, HOW MANY PEOPLE FROM HARBOR DID YOU HAVE COME OVER TO DO THE TRAINING 6 7 ROUGHLY? YOU KNOW, DO YOU HAVE... 8 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THERE HAVE BEEN DOZENS AND DOZENS. 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: DOZENS AND DOZENS. AND DID YOU GET 11 FEEDBACK FROM THE PEOPLE WHO ARE GOING OVER THERE FROM HARBOR, 12 GOING OVER TO KING FROM HARBOR TO DO THE TRAINING? DID YOU GET 13 ANY FEEDBACK ON WHAT THEY SAW WHEN THEY WERE THERE? 14 15 16 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: YES, SUPERVISOR. 17 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: CAN YOU GIVE US A CLUE AS TO WHAT 19 KIND OF FEEDBACK YOU WERE GETTING? 20 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THE HARBOR STAFF SAW A GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS 21 22 WHO REALLY WANT THEIR HOSPITAL TO SUCCEED, WHO REALLY

24

23

BELIEVE...



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY, I WASN'T REALLY-- I
- 2 APPRECIATE YOU-- I'M PUTTING YOU IN A TOUGH SPOT BUT I'M NOT
- 3 ASKING FOR, YOU KNOW, WHAT WAS THE SPIRIT OF THE PLACE. I'M
- 4 ASKING, DID YOU GET ANY FEEDBACK ON THE COMPETENCY LEVEL OF
- 5 THE PEOPLE THEY WERE TRAINING?

6

- 7 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: YOU KNOW, SUPERVISOR, I THINK IT WOULD BE
- 8 FAIRER TO SAY THAT THEY WERE SURPRISED AT THE AMOUNT OF
- 9 TRAINING THAT THEY NEEDED TO DO.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I KNOW MRS. MOLINA, THIS IS STILL
- 12 ON YOUR TIME. ONE LAST QUESTION. BACK TO THE QUESTION THAT
- 13 BOTH MRS. MOLINA AND BURKE ASKED. DID YOU-- I'M SORRY. DID YOU
- 14 EVER INFORM THE BOARD THAT-- I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION YOU
- 15 HAD INFORMED THE BOARD BUT MAYBE IT WAS IN A CONVERSATION THAT
- 16 YOU AND I HAD, MAYBE IT WAS IN A CLOSED SESSION, I DON'T KNOW,
- 17 BUT DID YOU EVER INFORM THE BOARD ON THE DECISION YOU MADE IN
- 18 FEBRUARY OR MARCH, WHENEVER IT WAS, TO DO THE TRAINING AT
- 19 M.L.K. AND NOT AT HARBOR?

20

21 SUP. BURKE: I KEEP TELLING PEOPLE IT WAS GOING THAT WAY.

- 23 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: YOU KNOW, SUPERVISOR, I MAY HAVE SPOKEN
- 24 WITH ONE OR TWO OF YOU ABOUT IT INDIVIDUALLY. IT REALLY--
- 25 THERE WAS NO ONE SPECIFIC POINT IN TIME WHERE THAT DECISION



- 1 WAS MADE BECAUSE, AS PEOPLE WERE DOING THEIR EVALUATIONS AND
- 2 INTERVIEWS, I MEAN THIS WORK WAS HAPPENING VERY QUICKLY AND
- 3 THE EVALUATIONS OF FUNCTIONAL AREAS WOULD BE COMPLETED AT
- 4 DIFFERENT POINTS IN TIME AND SOLVING THOSE PROBLEMS OCCURRED
- 5 NOT AT AN INDIVIDUAL POINT IN TIME BUT OVER MULTIPLE, MULTIPLE
- 6 PLANNING MEETINGS OVER A HANDFUL OF WEEKS. SO I THINK THE
- 7 ANSWER IS NO, I DON'T THINK I'VE EVER...

8

9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. YOU ANSWERED IT.

10

11 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: ...I DID NOT...

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YOU DIDN'T FORMALLY DO IT. OKAY,
- 14 MS. MOLINA.

- 16 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. THE REASON WE'RE ASKING THESE
- 17 QUESTIONS IS THAT IT'S OBVIOUSLY VERY, VERY DIFFERENT AS WHAT
- 18 WE UNDERSTOOD WAS GOING TO HAPPEN AND WHAT ACTUALLY THE
- 19 DEPARTMENT IMPLEMENTED. WE WOULDN'T BE ASKING THESE OUESTIONS
- 20 IF WE ALREADY KNEW. CERTAINLY THE INTERPRETATION THAT I
- 21 RECEIVED IS THAT WE ALL-- WE WERE AS CLOSE TO STARTING ANEW.
- 22 BUT THERE HAVE BEEN MANY ISSUES THAT EACH OF US THINK ARE
- 23 DRAMATICALLY DIFFERENT. AND CERTAINLY, WHEN I LOOKED AT THE
- 24 NUMBERS AND PARTICULARLY LOOKED AT "THE LEADERSHIP" AT M.L.K.,
- 25 THERE WAS NOT THE KIND OF DRAMATIC CHANGE THAT I THOUGHT OR AT



- 1 LEAST I FELT WAS WARRANTED. SO, IN ORDER FOR US TO HAVE A
- 2 CLEAR UNDERSTANDING, YOU HAVE TO DO THAT CHART THAT I
- 3 ENUMERATED. AND IF YOU NEED ANY CLARIFICATION ON IT, PLEASE
- 4 COME TO ME. I'LL BE MORE THAN HAPPY TO OUTLINE EXACTLY WHAT I
- 5 NEED. BUT, IN ADDITION, I THINK WE ALSO HAVE TO GET A BETTER
- 6 UNDERSTANDING OF THOSE 70 PERCENT OF EMPLOYEES THAT WE
- 7 RETAINED, I NEED TO KNOW THE LEVEL OF COMPETENCY THAT WE
- 8 BEGAN. FOR EXAMPLE, ONE OF THE NUMBERS YOU USED THAT WAS A
- 9 LITTLE BIT TROUBLING AND STILL CONTINUES TO BE TROUBLING AND
- 10 ANTOINETTE USED IT THE LAST TIME, IS HOW MANY NURSES? AND
- 11 WE'RE GETTING MORE OUT OF THIS FROM THE PAPER THAT HAD TO BE
- 12 REEDUCATED, RETRAINED, RE-EXAMINED, HOW MANY DIDN'T PASS, I'M
- 13 CONCERNED ABOUT THAT END OF IT BECAUSE, CERTAINLY, IT WAS NOT
- 14 MY INTENTION-- AND I DON'T KNOW THE REST OF THE BOARD BUT IT
- 15 WAS ALWAYS MY INTENTION THAT WE WERE GIVING YOU THE LIBERTY,
- 16 UNLIKE ANY OTHER DEPARTMENT, TO GET RID OF EVERYBODY AND START
- 17 NEW AND TO BRING ON NEW PEOPLE. IT DIDN'T SAY TO YOU, "GO TAKE
- 18 CARE OF THOSE FOLKS AND FIND OUT WHO CAN, YOU KNOW, IF WE
- 19 RETRAIN THEM, THAT THEY CAN HANG ON." THAT WAS NOT THE INTENT.
- 20 OBVIOUSLY, HOW YOU INTERPRETED IT, HOW MS. EPPS INTERPRETED
- 21 IT, HOW THE LEADERSHIP AT HARBOR INTERPRETED IT WAS DIFFERENT.
- 22 AND I'M NOT SO SURE THAT HARBOR UNDERSTOOD THAT, EITHER. I
- 23 DON'T KNOW HOW HARBOR FEELS NOW WHEN THEY SAY M.L.K.-HARBOR. I
- 24 AM SURE THAT THERE ARE EMPLOYEES THERE AND OTHERS THAT ARE
- 25 CONCERNED ABOUT WHATEVER THE LAPSE OF COMPETENCY AT MARTIN



- 1 LUTHER KING IS SHADOWING ON HARBOR. BUT I AM CONCERNED THAT
- 2 CERTAINLY I HAD A DIFFERENT INTERPRETATION OF WHAT WAS GOING
- 3 TO OCCUR. SO WE NEED THAT CHART. WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND IT. I
- 4 ALSO NEED TO KNOW, ON THE LEADERSHIP POSITIONS, WHICH ONES
- 5 WERE CHANGED, WHICH ONES WERE KEPT, AND HOW THAT WAS OPERATED,
- 6 WHETHER IT BE NURSING MANAGER, NURSING SUPERVISOR, YOU KNOW,
- 7 NURSING DIRECTOR, I DON'T KNOW ALL THESE LEVELS OF CATEGORIES
- 8 BUT YOU NEED TO BREAK IT DOWN THAT WAY AND PARTICULARLY FOR
- 9 THE HOSPITAL. BECAUSE -- AND I KNOW THAT I'M NOT ALONE ON THIS,
- 10 DR. CHERNOF, SO DON'T-- WHAT WAS SAID, WE HEARD IT COMPLETELY
- 11 DIFFERENT FROM WHAT WAS DONE AND IT'S NOT PUZZLING TO-- IT
- 12 SHOULD NOT BE PUZZLING TO YOU BUT WE'RE NOT ASKING THESE
- 13 QUESTIONS BECAUSE WE ALREADY KNEW THIS. I WAS STARTLED, A
- 14 COUPLE OF WEEKS AGO, WHEN I FOUND OUT THE NUMBER OF,
- 15 PARTICULARLY THE ETHNIC BREAKDOWN OF THESE EMPLOYEES WHEN WE
- 16 FOUND OUT THAT SO MUCH OF THE LEADERSHIP WAS STILL THERE. ALL
- 17 OF A SUDDEN SAID, "WAIT A MINUTE, THAT'S NOT WHAT WAS SUPPOSED
- 18 TO HAPPEN." SO TOMORROW, HOPEFULLY, YOU CAN OUTLINE THAT, AS
- 19 WELL AS HOW MANY OF THOSE EMPLOYEES CAME ON. LIKE, A NURSING
- 20 SUPERVISOR AT HARBOR WHO INTERVIEWED A NURSE AND SAID, "WELL,
- 21 WE COULD KEEP HER BUT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO RETRAIN HER,
- 22 REEDUCATE HER AND SHE'S GOING TO HAVE TO PASS THE FOLLOWING
- 23 TESTS." I MEAN, IT'S SORT OF A VERY DIFFERENT. AND WHAT WAS
- 24 THE INTERPRETATION THAT "THE HARBOR INTERVIEWERS" HAD OF WHAT
- 25 THEIR RESPONSIBILITY WAS. AS IT'S TO KEEP THEM IF YOU CAN



- 1 TRAIN THEM OR MOVE THEM OUT, GET SOMEBODY NEW TO FILL THOSE
- 2 POSITIONS. AND PARTICULARLY IN BRINGING ON NEW PEOPLE, HOW
- 3 MANY OF THEM, HOW MANY WERE INTERVIEWED, WHAT WAS THE REQUEST
- 4 TO BRING IN NEW PEOPLE? I'D LIKE TO SEE ALL OF THAT BECAUSE
- 5 WHAT WE UNDERSTOOD WAS REALLY VERY DIFFERENT AND IT'S VERY
- 6 CLEAR. SO I'M MORE INTERESTED IN THE NUMBERS BECAUSE THAT'S
- 7 WHERE OUR PROBLEMS HAVE OCCURRED FOR THE HOSPITAL BUT I ALSO
- 8 WANT THE NUMBERS FOR THE OUTPATIENT BECAUSE IT'S ALWAYS BEEN A
- 9 CHANGE OF WHAT LEFT AND WHAT WENT OUT, AND ALL OF THAT. AT THE
- 10 SAME TIME, I'M JUST MORE TROUBLED BY THE 70 PERCENT OF
- 11 EMPLOYEES AT MARTIN LUTHER KING THAT ARE STILL THERE AND HAVE
- 12 BEEN THERE THROUGHOUT THE AGONY OF THIS ENTIRE HOSPITAL. SO WE
- 13 NEED ALL OF THAT. AND, HOPEFULLY, YOU CAN BRING IT TO US
- 14 TOMORROW.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. THANKS. LET ME JUST FOLLOW
- 17 UP A FEW QUESTIONS ON THIS FROM THE BUDGETARY POINT OF VIEW
- 18 BECAUSE THERE'S A BUDGETARY IMPLICATION TO THIS, AS YOUR
- 19 REPORT INDICATED. ONE OF THE REASONS THAT THE EXPENDITURE
- 20 LEVEL ON THE METRO CARE PLAN DIDN'T REACH THE LEVEL THAT WAS
- 21 ANTICIPATED WAS BECAUSE YOU DIDN'T HAVE, ACCORDING TO YOUR
- 22 REPORT, YOU DIDN'T HAVE TO TRANSFER AS MANY PEOPLE TO OTHER
- 23 FACILITIES, IS THAT CORRECT?

24

25 ALAN WECKER: YES.



1

- 2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THE ASSUMPTION ON THE NUMBER OF
- 3 PEOPLE YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER WHEN YOU FIRST STARTED
- 4 METROCARE THAT RESULTED IN A HIGHER ESTIMATED COST TO THE
- 5 METROCARE PLAN, WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF THOSE TRANSFERS GOING
- 6 TO BE? WHAT WAS THE ASSUMPTION? WHAT WAS THE BASIS OF THE
- 7 ASSUMPTION FOR THOSE TRANSFERS?

8

- 9 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, I'M NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND THE
- 10 QUESTION.

11

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. YOU WERE GOING TO
- 13 TRANSFER A CERTAIN NUMBER OF PEOPLE TO OTHER HOSPITALS FROM
- 14 M.L.K., CORRECT?

15

16 SUP. MOLINA: WHICH IS WHAT WE INCURRED THE MONEY FOR.

17

18 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: YES.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND YOU ENDED UP NOT TRANSFERRING
- 21 AS MANY AS YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER, CORRECT?

22

23 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: CORRECT.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: RESULTING IN A REDUCED COST TO THE
- 2 METROCARE PLAN OR WHAT HAS BECOME SOMEWHAT OF A SAVINGS IN THE
- 3 CONTEXT OF THIS BUDGET GOING FORWARD AND AFFECTS THIS NEW
- 4 YEAR, CORRECT?

5

6 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: CORRECT.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. SO YOU DIDN'T TRANSFER AS
- 9 MANY TO OTHER HOSPITALS AS YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE. WHEN YOU
- 10 ORIGINALLY PROPOSED THE METROCARE PLAN AND YOU THOUGHT YOU
- 11 WERE GOING TO PROPOSE-- THAT YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER X AND
- 12 YOU ONLY TRANSFERRED .3X OR WHATEVER IT TURNED OUT TO BE, WHEN
- 13 YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER X NUMBER OF PEOPLE ALL OVER THE
- 14 SYSTEM, ALL OVER OUR SYSTEM, WHAT WAS GOING TO BE THE REASON
- 15 YOU TRANSFERRED THEM?

- 17 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: TO FIT A STAFFING MODEL THAT MADE SENSE FOR
- 18 A SMALL, THE SMALLER COMMUNITY HOSPITAL THAT WE WERE PLANNING.
- 19 AND THE REASON FOR THE DIFFERENCE, SUPERVISOR, IS BECAUSE,
- 20 ONE, WE DID ACTUALLY REMOVE A LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE BUT A LOT
- 21 OF THOSE FOLKS TURNED OUT NOT TO BE COUNTY EMPLOYEES. THEY
- 22 WERE REGISTER STAFF OR TRAVELER STAFF. AND OUR GOAL WOULD HAVE
- 23 BEEN TO KEEP ABSOLUTELY THE BEST PEOPLE, WHETHER THEY BE
- 24 TRAVEL OR REGISTRY, BECAUSE THAT WOULD HELP IMPROVE OUR



- 1 LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS AND IMPROVE THE STRENGTH OF THE CLINICAL
- 2 PROGRAM. SO...

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: BUT WHAT I'M FOCUSED ON, HOW MANY
- 5 PEOPLE DID YOU THINK ORIGINALLY YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER
- 6 FROM KING TO OTHER HOSPITALS, ROUGHLY?

7

8 ALAN WECKER: ABOUT 1,200.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ABOUT 1,200. HOW MANY DID YOU END
- 11 UP TRANSFERRING?

12

13 **ALAN WECKER:** 391.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: 391. SO IT WAS CLOSE, 1/3. ALL
- 16 RIGHT. SO THERE ARE 809 PEOPLE WHO YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING
- 17 TO TRANSFER WHO ENDED UP NOT BEING TRANSFERRED, CORRECT?

18

19 ALAN WECKER: YES.

20

- 21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHY DID THOSE 800 NOT GET
- 22 TRANSFERRED?

- 24 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WELL, I BELIEVE, SUPERVISOR, FOR TWO
- 25 REASONS. ONE, I-- YOU KNOW, THE END, THAT SORT OF 60/40



- 1 ESTIMATE WAS BASED ON INPUT FROM SEVERAL OF OUR C.E.O.S AND
- 2 REPRESENTED A GOOD GUESS BUT IT WASN'T A TERRIBLY INFORMED
- 3 NUMBER BECAUSE NOBODY'D EVER DONE ANYTHING LIKE THIS BEFORE.
- 4 SO WHAT, I MEAN...

5

6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YOU MEAN THE 1,200?

7

- 8 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: ONE IS THE QUALITY OF THE ESTIMATE ITSELF
- 9 AND WHAT I'M TELLING YOU IS THE QUALITY OF THE ESTIMATE WAS
- 10 LIMITED SINCE THERE WAS NO HISTORY.

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. FAIR ENOUGH. FAIR ENOUGH. SO
- 13 THE 1,200 THAT YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER, OF WHICH ONLY 391
- 14 GOT TRANSFERRED, ALL OF THOSE PEOPLE WERE GOING TO BE
- 15 TRANSFERRED-- WELL, LET ME ASK YOU THIS QUESTION AND I MAY BE
- 16 TOTALLY WRONG. WERE ALL OF THE ONES THAT WERE GOING TO BE
- 17 TRANSFERRED GOING TO BE TRANSFERRED BECAUSE THEY DID NOT
- 18 MEASURE UP YOUR TO YOUR STANDARDS AND THEY NEEDED TRAINING AND
- 19 THEY WERE GOING TO BE TRAINED ELSEWHERE AND OVERSEEN? ONE OF
- 20 THE THINGS, IF YOU WILL RECALL, THAT YOU TOLD US THAT WAS
- 21 GOING TO HAPPEN HERE IS THAT YOU WERE GOING TO FIRE SOME
- 22 PEOPLE IF YOU HAD THE GOODS IN THE PERSONNEL FILE, WHICH IS AN
- 23 ISSUE AT M.L.K., SINCE EVERYBODY, ALMOST EVERYBODY HAD
- 24 OUTSTANDING PERSONNEL FILES BUT THOSE THAT YOU COULD-- THAT
- 25 DIDN'T MEASURE UP, THAT WARRANTED FIRING, YOU WOULD FIRE AND



- 1 THOSE THAT NEEDED TRAINING, YOU WOULD DEPLOY THEM ELSEWHERE
- 2 AND-- NOT JUST AT HARBOR BUT ALL THROUGHOUT OUR SYSTEM. AND
- 3 THEN DO TWO THINGS, TRAIN THEM AND MONITOR THEM, MONITOR THEM
- 4 TO SEE, BASICALLY, TO HAVE INDEPENDENT PERSONNEL OVERSEE THEM
- 5 THAT YOU DIDN'T FEEL-- WE DIDN'T FEEL COMFORTABLE YOU HAD AT
- 6 M.L.K. AND YOU PROBABLY DIDN'T FEEL, EITHER. SO THAT YOU'D HAD
- 7 SOMEBODY AT COUNTY U.S.C. OR AT OLIVE VIEW OR AT HARBOR TAKING
- 8 A LOOK AT MR. X OR MS. X AND SAYING, "HEY, SHE'S TERRIFIC. SHE
- 9 OUGHT TO BE IN THE HALL OF FAME, "OR "SHE'S A DISASTER AND
- 10 WHAT'S SHE DOING WORKING FOR US IN THE FIRST PLACE?" AND YOU'D
- 11 HAVE SOME INDEPENDENT LOOK. SO THERE WERE TWO, TRAINING AND
- 12 INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT OF THEIR CAPABILITIES, THEIR COMPETENCY.
- 13 AM I CORRECT SO FAR?

14

15 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THAT'S CORRECT.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SO ARE THESE 1,200 THAT
- 18 YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER, AND I UNDERSTAND THAT
- 19 THE ESTIMATE IS AN ESTIMATE, THAT THE 1,200 YOU WERE GOING TO
- 20 TRANSFER ALL FELL UNDER THIS CATEGORY OF THEY DIDN'T MEASURE
- 21 UP AND YOU DIDN'T WANT TO RISK THEM STAYING AT M.L.K.?

- 23 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: A COMMENT AND THEN AN ANSWER. FIRST, THAT
- 24 1,200 REPRESENTS RUNNING THAT 60 PERCENT ACROSS THE ENTIRE
- 25 POPULATION OF THE HOSPITAL. IS THAT CORRECT, ALAN?

24

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 2 ALAN WECKER: YES. 3 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: AND WE'VE NEVER COMPLETED THE OUTPATIENT 4 5 WORK. SO THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT POINT. 6 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU JUST 8 SAID. SAY IT AGAIN AND EXPLAIN IT. 9 ALAN WECKER: WHAT BASICALLY WE DID IS WE LOOKED AT THE TOTAL 10 11 AMOUNT OF EMPLOYEES AT M.L.K.-HARBOR, BOTH INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT, AND WE MADE AN ASSUMPTION THAT 60 PERCENT OF THAT 12 13 TOTAL WOULD BE WHAT WOULD BE TRANSFERRED OUT. 14 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. AND I THOUGHT THE TOTAL 16 NUMBER WAS 3,188. 17 18 ALAN WECKER: THAT'S THE BUDGET NUMBER. 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. AND WHAT ARE YOU TALKING 20 ABOUT? TAKE YOUR TIME. I DON'T WANT YOU TO RUSH INTO THIS. 21 22 23 ALAN WECKER: IT WAS BASED ON THE 2,066.

SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: 2,066? 2,066 REPRESENTED WHAT?

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1

- 2 ALAN WECKER: THOSE ARE THE AMOUNT THAT WE EXPECTED TO BE AT
- 3 M.L.K.-HARBOR WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE. IF YOU LOOK AT YOUR
- 4 FINAL CHANGES BUDGET, THAT IS THE TOTAL POSITION COUNT AS OF
- 5 THIS BUDGET. SO IT WOULD BE BASED ON THE TOTAL POPULATION OF
- 6 2,066, WE ASSUMED 60%.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: 2,066 IS THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE YOU
- 9 ACTUALLY-- NUMBER OF BODIES YOU HAD WORKING THERE?

10

- 11 ALAN WECKER: NO. THOSE ARE THE AMOUNT OF BODIES, THOSE ARE THE
- 12 AMOUNT OF POSITIONS THAT ARE IN THE FINAL CHANGES BUDGET FOR
- 13 '07/'08. WE LOOKED AT THE-- THIS IS WHAT WE EXPECTED TO OCCUR.
- 14 THESE ARE HOW MANY BODIES OR POSITIONS.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. AND SO THE DECLINE, THE
- 17 DIMINUTION OF STAFFING FROM 3,188 TO 2,066, IS THAT AN APPLES
- 18 TO APPLES?

19

20 ALAN WECKER: YES.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO THAT'S ABOUT 1,122, ACTUALLY.
- 23 THAT'S THE FIGURE THAT BRUCE INDICATED EARLIER.

24

25 ALAN WECKER: RIGHT.



1

2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND, OF THOSE 1,122, WHICH THE

3 WORDS YOU USED WERE DISAPPEARED, WERE THEY AMONG THE -- WERE

4 THE LION'S SHARE OF THOSE GOING TO BE DEPLOYED ELSEWHERE?

5 REASSIGNED ELSEWHERE? REMOVED? FIRED? OR A COMBINATION OF

6 BOTH?

7

8 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: MOSTLY, AGAIN, SUPERVISOR, THE SPECIFIC

9 GOAL WAS TO-- IF YOU DIDN'T HAVE A COMPETENT OR BETTER

10 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION, YOU WOULDN'T-- THOSE ARE PEOPLE WHO

11 WOULD BE UNDER PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND WOULD POTENTIALLY BE

12 FIRED OR WHATEVER, WHEREVER THEY WERE IN THE PROCESS OF THEIR

13 PERFORMANCE REVIEW. THE FOLKS WHO GOT INTERVIEWED WERE THOSE

14 THAT HAD A COMPETENT PERFORMANCE OR BETTER JACKET. THAT'S WHAT

15 LED TO YOUR INTERVIEW. THOSE PEOPLE WERE MITIGATED FOR TWO

16 REASONS. ONE, BECAUSE, BASED ON THE INTERVIEW PROCESS, THEY

17 DIDN'T HAVE THE STRONGER SKILLS WITH RESPECT TO THE NEEDS OF

18 THE NEW HOSPITAL. BUT THE OTHER REASON IS IS THAT WE WERE

19 PUTTING IN PLACE A SMALLER STAFFING PLAN. IT'S NOT THE SAME

20 SIZE HOSPITAL. SO, AT THE END OF THE DAY, SOME OF THE PEOPLE

21 WHO WERE MITIGATED WERE MITIGATED SIMPLY BECAUSE THERE WAS NO

22 LONGER A NEED FOR THAT SERVICE. WE'RE NOT DELIVERING INPATIENT

23 PEDIATRICS ANY MORE SO...



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I UNDERSTAND BUT, YOU SEE, WELL,
- 2 THE CONFUSION THAT I'M HAVING AND MAYBE OTHERS ARE HAVING IS
- 3 THIS. YOU ESTIMATED THAT YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER 1,200
- 4 PEOPLE, THAT'S WHAT YOUR TESTIMONY WAS A MINUTE AGO, 1,200
- 5 PEOPLE FROM M.L.K. TO OTHER FACILITIES FOR WHATEVER THE
- 6 REASON, I'M NOT CLEAR WHAT THE REASONS ARE AND I'M NOT GOING
- 7 TO TAKE ANY MORE TIME TODAY. WE'LL DEAL WITH THAT TOMORROW.
- 8 BUT YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER 1,200 PEOPLE FROM M.L.K. TO
- 9 OTHER FACILITIES. YOU ENDED UP ONLY TRANSFERRING 391, ABOUT A
- 10 THIRD OF THEM. AND YOU'RE EXPLAINING THAT BY SAYING THAT,
- ORIGINALLY, YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER THE 1,200 BECAUSE YOU
- 12 WERE GOING TO HAVE A DOWNSIZED FACILITY. YOU END UP
- 13 TRANSFERRING ONLY A THIRD OF THE PEOPLE THAT YOU THOUGHT YOU
- 14 WERE GOING TO TRANSFER. YOU DO HAVE A DOWNSIZED FACILITY, IT
- 15 IS RADICALLY DOWNSIZED. FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, THE
- 16 HOSPITAL IS CLOSED EXCEPT FOR THE EMERGENCY ROOM AND THE
- 17 BASICS THAT ARE RUN ON THE 45, ROUGHLY, 45 BEDS THAT YOU'RE
- 18 OCCUPYING OUT OF THE HUNDREDS THAT USED TO BE THERE. SO IT'S A
- 19 SUBSTANTIALLY DIMINISHED HOSPITAL AND I THINK WE ALL
- 20 UNDERSTAND THAT. TRAUMA CENTER IS CLOSED. THE N.I.C.U. IS
- 21 BARELY WORKING, IF IT'S WORKING AT ALL. PEDIATRICS, THE WHOLE
- 22 NINE YARDS. SO YOU'VE GOT A SIGNIFICANTLY DIMINISHED HOSPITAL
- 23 AND YET YOU DIDN'T TRANSFER TWO-THIRDS OF THE PEOPLE THAT YOU
- 24 THOUGHT YOU WERE GOING TO TRANSFER IN ORDER TO GET-- TO
- 25 APPROPRIATELY STAFF A DIMINISHED HOSPITAL. WHICH TELLS ME ONE



- 1 OF TWO THINGS. WHAT IT TELLS ME IS ONE THING, AND I'M SURE
- 2 THIS IS NOT WHAT YOU INTENDED SO PLEASE EXPLAIN TO ME WHY I'M
- 3 WRONG IN MAKING THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT. IT SOUNDS TO ME LIKE
- 4 YOU'VE GOT AN OVERSTAFFED HOSPITAL. IF YOU'VE DIMINISHED A
- 5 HOSPITAL DOWN TO 45 BEDS A NIGHT AND THE ONLY THING YOU'VE GOT
- 6 OPERATING, FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, IS THE EMERGENCY ROOM
- 7 AND SOME ANCILLARY FACILITIES AND YOU THOUGHT THAT, BY
- 8 DIMINISHING THE HOSPITAL, YOU'D HAVE TO MOVE 1,200 PEOPLE OUT
- 9 OF THE FACILITY AND YOU'VE ONLY MOVED 391, THEN WHY SHOULDN'T
- 10 WE ALL CONCLUDE THAT YOU'VE OVERSTAFFED THE HOSPITAL FOR THE
- 11 AMOUNT OF SERVICE IT DELIVERS?

12

- 13 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, TWO THINGS. NUMBER ONE, WE'VE
- 14 DONE NO MITIGATIONS OR ANY CHANGES.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHAT DOES MITIGATION MEAN IN THIS
- 17 CONTEXT?

18

- 19 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: TO DECREASE IN STAFFING ON THE OUTPATIENT
- 20 SIDE. THERE HAVE BEEN NO INTERVIEWS OR NO WORK DONE AND THERE
- 21 WAS NO WORK INTENDED TO BE DONE ON THE OUTPATIENT SIDE
- 22 INITIALLY. SO THAT'S THE FIRST THING.

23

24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S PART OF THE 1,200 NUMBER.



- 1 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SO-- AND THE SECOND THING, SUPERVISOR, IS
- 2 THAT-- I LOST MY THOUGHT.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YOU'LL REGAIN IT. LET ME ASK YOU
- 5 ON THE OUTPATIENT SIDE. WERE YOU PLANNING, OF THE 1,200, YOU
- 6 SAID THAT INCLUDES INPATIENT AND OUTPATIENT. I THOUGHT YOU
- 7 SAID A FEW MOMENTS AGO THAT THE LION'S SHARE, IF NOT ALL OF
- 8 THE MITIGATION, AS YOU CALL IT, WAS GOING TO BE ON THE
- 9 INPATIENT SIDE. WAS THERE GOING TO BE ANY DOWNSIZING IN THE
- 10 OUTPATIENT SIDE?

11

- 12 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, THE ENTIRE FACILITY WAS
- 13 RELATIVELY OVERSTAFFED FOR THE VOLUME OF WORK THAT IT WAS
- 14 DOING AND SO THERE IS NEED TO LOOK AT EITHER INCREASING THE
- 15 AMOUNT OF WORK WE'RE DOING FOR THE NUMBER OF F.T.E. WE HAVE OR
- 16 DECREASING THE NUMBER OF F.T.E. WE HAVE RELATIVE TO THE AMOUNT
- 17 OF WORK WE'RE DOING BUT PART OF THAT HAS TO DO WITH THE MODEL
- 18 OF CARE. SO THE OUTPATIENT PIECE HAS NOT BEEN DONE YET AND
- 19 WASN'T PLANNED TO BE DONE YET. SO THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY, ON
- 20 THE OUTPATIENT SIDE, TO HAVE A MORE EFFICIENT FOOTPRINT.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND WAS THE 1,200 FIGURE-- DO YOU
- 23 KNOW WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THAT 1,200 THAT YOU ANTICIPATED
- 24 TRANSFERRING TO OTHER FACILITIES WERE ON THE OUTPATIENT SIDE?



- 1 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: I THINK, SUPERVISOR, IT WOULD BE HELP.F.U.L
- 2 IF WE PULLED THESE NUMBER TOGETHER CLEARLY FOR YOU TOMORROW.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. FINE. BUT I WAS UNDER
- 5 THE IMPRESSION THE LION'S SHARE WERE INPATIENT BECAUSE THAT'S
- 6 WHERE THE LION'S SHARE OF THE DOWNSIZING WAS TO BE. I MEAN, WE
- 7 SEE WHAT THE DOWNSIZING ON THE INPATIENT SIDE HAS BEEN.

8

- 9 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: AGAIN, SUPERVISOR, THE 60/40 NUMBER WAS A
- 10 NUMBER THAT OUR FINANCE TEAM DEVELOPED WITH INPUT FROM C.E.O.S
- 11 ACROSS OUR ORGANIZATION. IT WAS, AT BEST, A GOOD ESTIMATE.

12

13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND WHAT IS 60/40 A REFERENCE TO?

14

- 15 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: THE NUMBER OF POSITION DECREASES THAT WERE
- 16 INITIALLY PROPOSED IN THE METROCARE PLAN WAS BASED ON SOME
- 17 VERY HIGH LEVEL MODELING THAT GARY WELLS DID WITH SEVERAL OF
- 18 OUR C.E.O.S. BUT, BECAUSE THE DEPARTMENT HAD NEVER DONE
- 19 ANYTHING LIKE THIS AND THERE ISN'T A SIMPLE MODEL TO FOLLOW,
- 20 IT WAS AT BEST AN INFORMED ESTIMATE.

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. I'M NOT GETTING SATISFACTION
- 23 BUT PART OF IT IS BECAUSE MAYBE I'M NOT ASKING THE RIGHT
- 24 QUESTIONS. BUT THE LAST QUESTION I'M GOING TO ASK YOU ON THIS
- 25 SUBJECT IS WHEN I WAS TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THIS THE LAST



- 1 COUPLE OF WEEKS, YOU AND YOUR FOLKS SAID THAT -- AND THE C.A.O.
- 2 SAID THIS, TOO, THAT THE SAVINGS OR THE REDUCED EXPENDITURES
- 3 ON THIS TRANSFER BUSINESS WAS REALIZED BECAUSE, IF YOU WERE
- 4 GOING TO TAKE A STAFFER FROM M.L.K. AND MOVE HIM TO COUNTY
- 5 U.S.C., YOU WERE GOING TO HAVE TO BACKFILL THAT PERSON THAT
- 6 YOU JUST TRANSFERRED BACK AT M.L.K. BECAUSE YOU HAVEN'T
- 7 TRANSFERRED AS MANY PEOPLE, SO GOES THE ARGUMENT, BECAUSE YOU
- 8 HAVEN'T TRANSFERRED AS MANY PEOPLE TO OTHER FACILITIES, THE
- 9 REQUIRED NUMBER OF BACKFILLS HAS CONCOMITANTLY PLUMMETED. AND,
- 10 THEREFORE, WHAT YOU HAD ASSUMED TO HAVE BEEN A COST, THE
- 11 BACKFILLING PORTION OF THIS, DID NOT MATERIALIZE AND,
- 12 THEREFORE-- THIS DOESN'T MAKE SENSE TO YOU?

14 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: WELL, THE FIRST-- ONE COMMENT THERE,

- 15 SUPERVISOR, IS THAT JUST BECAUSE YOU TRANSFER SOMEBODY DOESN'T
- 16 MEAN THERE WOULD BE A BACKFILL.
- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IT SHOULDN'T. IT SHOULDN'T MEAN
- 19 IT, RIGHT.
- 21 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: RIGHT. BECAUSE YOU HAVE A MUCH SMALLER
- 22 STAFFING FOOTPRINT. A LOT OF THE PEOPLE WHO WERE MOVED WERE
- 23 MOVED SIMPLY BECAUSE THERE WAS NO LONGER A POSITION.

24

13

17



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: EXCEPT, BRUCE, THAT THE ONLY WAY
- 2 YOU COULD-- THAT THIS COULD RESULT IN A SAVINGS, THE ONLY WAY
- 3 THAT NOT TRANSFERRING TWO-THIRDS OF THE PEOPLE YOU THOUGHT YOU
- 4 WERE GOING TO TRANSFER RESULTS IN A SAVINGS IS THAT SOMEWHERE
- 5 THERE'S AN EXPENDITURE THAT HASN'T BEEN MADE. SO WHERE'S THE
- 6 EXPENDITURE THAT HASN'T BEEN MADE?

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SUPERVISOR, IT'S IN AN OVER HIRE. WE ASSUMED
- 9 THAT X NUMBER OF PEOPLE WOULD GO FROM KING THAT WOULD HAVE NO
- 10 BUDGETED POSITION AND WE'D HAVE TO OVER HIRE TO CARRY THEM. SO
- 11 IT'S A COST AVOIDANCE, I GUESS, REALLY. IT'S NOT A BACKFILL.
- 12 WE DON'T HAVE NOW 200 PEOPLE AT L.A.C. U.S.C. THAT AREN'T IN
- 13 BUDGETED POSITIONS BUT WE ARE PAYING FOR THEM BECAUSE WE
- 14 AGREED TO DO IT. SO IT'S ON THE FLIP SIDE THAT WE'RE SEEING
- 15 THE SAVINGS.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. SO IT'S NOT BACKFILL. IT'S
- 18 FRONT FILL.

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: FRONT FILL. OVERFILL.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: NEW BUREAUCRATIC TERM IS BORN
- 23 TODAY RIGHT HERE. [LAUGHTER]



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: BUT I THINK, I AGREE WITH BRUCE THAT WE CAN
- 2 HAVE A MUCH BETTER DISCUSSION TOMORROW ABOUT THIS WITH ALL THE
- 3 NUMBERS BROKEN DOWN.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THAT'S FAIR. BUT I THINK THAT, IN
- 6 ORDER TO HAVE THIS KIND OF A...

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE NEED TO UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE LOOKING FOR.

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: NOW YOU HAVE AT LEAST SOME SENSE
- 11 OF WHAT WE'RE DRIVING AT SO THAT YOU CAN BE RESPONSIVE.
- 12 OTHERWISE, WE WOULD HAVE HAD THIS LEVEL OF FRUSTRATION
- 13 TOMORROW, WHICH WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN A GOOD THING. SO TO THE
- 14 EXTENT YOU CAN EXPLAIN WHAT HAS TRANSPIRED AND WHY-- AND,
- 15 OBVIOUSLY, THE THING THAT'S LURKING IN THE BACKGROUND HERE IS-
- 16 AND MAYBE THIS IS AN OVERSIMPLIFICATION OR MAYBE IT'S
- 17 CUTTING THROUGH ALL THE B.S., WHICH IS THAT PEOPLE WHO
- 18 SHOULDN'T BE WORKING THERE ARE STILL WORKING THERE. AND WHEN
- 19 IT'S ALL SAID AND DONE, THAT YOUR ESTIMATE, UNDERSTANDING IT
- 20 WAS AN ESTIMATE THAT 1,200 PEOPLE NEEDED TO BE MOVED OUT, THAT
- 21 ONLY 391 GOT MOVED OUT, WHICH MEANS 809 PEOPLE-- ONE COULD
- 22 CONCLUDE THAT, OF THOSE 809 PEOPLE, A SIGNIFICANT PERCENTAGE
- 23 OF THEM DIDN'T MEASURE UP TO THE STANDARDS THAT WE HAD. THE
- 24 C.M.S. REVIEW, THE ONE THAT YOU WERE RESPONDING TO TODAY,
- 25 SUGGESTS THAT, JUST THE PERCENTAGES, THEIR FILE PULLING



- 1 SUGGESTED THAT. YOUR STATEMENT A MINUTE AGO, WHICH I THOUGHT
- 2 WAS VERY ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE SITUATION, THAT THE STAFF FROM
- 3 HARBOR THAT HAD GONE TO KING FOR THE PURPOSE OF TRAINING KING
- 4 PERSONNEL, THAT THE FEEDBACK YOU WERE GETTING WAS THAT THEY
- 5 WERE SURPRISED AT HOW MUCH TRAINING THEY NEEDED SUGGESTS THAT
- 6 WE'RE IN THE SITUATION WE'RE IN. I MEAN, THAT'S A CONCLUSION
- 7 THAT CAN BE DRAWN FROM THIS, THAT WE'RE IN THE SITUATION WE'RE
- 8 IN BECAUSE WE DIDN'T GO AS FAR AS WE KNEW WE NEEDED TO GO IN
- 9 PURGING THE ORGANIZATION OF ITS UNDERPERFORMING-- THAT'S A
- 10 EUPHEMISM, UNDERPERFORMING PERSONNEL. NOW, I'M VERY
- 11 SYMPATHETIC TO YOUR COMMENT THAT IT'S POSSIBLE, AND I DID HAVE
- 12 MORE THAN ONE CONVERSATION WITH YOU ON THIS SUBJECT, SO I'M
- 13 NOT SURPRISED AT WHAT WAS GOING ON. I JUST DIDN'T KNOW THE
- 14 NUMBERS AND I'M NOT POINTING A FINGER HERE. I UNDERSTAND THE
- 15 CIRCUMSTANCE YOU FACE. TO DO IT THE WAY YOU HAD ORIGINALLY
- 16 PROPOSED MAY-- AND WHY WE DIDN'T RAISE IT AT THE TIME, I DON'T
- 17 KNOW BUT YOU VIRTUALLY HAVE TO CLOSE THE HOSPITAL COMPLETELY
- 18 IN ORDER TO TAKE PEOPLE OUT AND TRAIN THEM. AND SO SOMEWHERE I
- 19 THINK YOU'VE BEEN TRYING TO RATIONALIZE IT. BUT THE RESULT IS
- 20 PRETTY-- IS PRETTY CLEAR. AND ALL OF THE INDEPENDENT FOLKS WHO
- 21 HAVE COME IN THERE HAVE MADE CERTAIN INITIAL JUDGMENTS. YOU
- 22 YOURSELF HAVE GOTTEN FEEDBACK THAT IS UNSATISFACTORY, MY
- 23 WORDS, NOT YOURS BUT I THINK YOUR WORDS CAN STAND ON THEIR
- 24 OWN. AND, I MEAN, I LOVE YOUR OPTIMISM. BUT, ONCE IN AWHILE,
- 25 REALISM HAS TO PLAY A ROLE, AS WELL. AND I DON'T THINK WE'D



- 1 HAVE A FIGHTING CHANCE IF THERE WASN'T A FEELING OF
- 2 POSSIBILITY ON YOUR PART AND ON THE REST OF US THAT THIS COULD
- 3 BE-- THAT THIS HOSPITAL COULD BE TURNED AROUND. BUT, AT THE
- 4 SAME TIME, WE CAN'T BE IN DENIAL ABOUT WHAT'S GOING ON,
- 5 EITHER, AND WE'RE ALL IN THIS TOGETHER. IT'S NOT YOU VERSUS
- 6 US, IT'S NOT US VERSUS YOU. WE'RE ALL IN IT TOGETHER. WE'RE
- 7 THE GOVERNING BODY. YOU'RE THE HEALTH DIRECTOR. YOU'RE A
- 8 SOLDIER IN OUR ARMY. AND THAT'S WHY WE GET PAID THE BIG BUCKS,
- 9 SO TO SPEAK. SO TOMORROW'S GOING TO BE-- SOME OF THESE
- 10 QUESTIONS NEED TO BE REALLY SPELLED OUT. THE MORE YOU CAN HELP
- 11 US DO THAT EARLY IN THE DISCUSSION, THE MORE PRODUCTIVE THE
- 12 DISCUSSION CAN BE. ALL RIGHT. MS. MOLINA?

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: COULD I ALSO ASK YOU TOMORROW TO BRING THE HARBOR
- 15 PERSON THAT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING LEADERSHIP TO THE
- 16 HOSPITAL? TO MARTIN LUTHER KING?

17

18 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: YES, SUPERVISOR.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: THANK YOU.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANY OTHER-- MR.
- 23 ANTONOVICH?



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHEN WE DO, YOU KNOW, REVIEWS OF EMPLOYEES,
- 2 IT SEEMS LIKE, IN THIS CASE, THERE WAS GREAT INFLATION IN THAT
- 3 YOU WERE RETAINING PEOPLE WHO OUGHT NOT TO HAVE BEEN RETAINED.
- 4 AND, IN A WAY, YOU'RE SHORTCHANGING THE PUBLIC BECAUSE JOHN Q.
- 5 CITIZEN, WHEN HE ENDS UP IN A HOSPITAL, IS EXPECTING THAT THE
- 6 STANDARDS WE EMPLOY ARE THE SAME STANDARDS WE WOULD EMPLOY FOR
- 7 FAMILY, FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS. AND YET IT APPEARS THAT, EVEN
- 8 THOUGH YOU DISMISSED, FIRED, RESIGNED 257 EMPLOYEES AND 65
- 9 DOCTORS, WHATEVER, THAT IT WASN'T ENOUGH BECAUSE STILL IN
- 10 PLACE WERE THOSE WHO SCRAPED BY THAT EVALUATION AND YET THEY
- 11 WERE IN A CRITICAL POSITION THAT DETERMINED LIFE OR DEATH OF
- 12 THOSE JOHN Q. CITIZENS WHO HAPPENED TO SEEK AID AND TREATMENT
- 13 AT THAT FACILITY. AND I WOULD HOPE THAT THIS IS A TRAGIC
- 14 WAKEUP CALL THAT WE CAN'T SHORTCHANGE STANDARDS.

- 16 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, YOU KNOW, I AGREE WITH YOUR
- 17 SENTIMENTS AND, AT THE END OF THE DAY, THIS HOSPITAL MUST MEET
- 18 FEDERAL STANDARDS AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, IT NEEDS TO MEET THE
- 19 DEPARTMENT'S AND THIS BOARD'S STANDARDS FOR WHAT CARE SHOULD
- 20 BE LIKE. YOU KNOW, I WILL SAY THAT, IN THE HISTORY OF THIS
- 21 DEPARTMENT-- AND I'LL GO OUT ON A LIMB AND SAY IN THE HISTORY
- 22 OF THE COUNTY, THERE PROBABLY HAS NOT BEEN EVER AS
- 23 COMPREHENSIVE AN EFFORT TO REALLY REVIEW EVERY SINGLE EMPLOYEE
- 24 ON THE GROUNDS OF A FACILITY AND I'M GLAD TO BE CORRECTED IF
- 25 I'M WRONG.



1

- 2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: BUT, IN THE EMERGENCY ROOM, IN THOSE VITAL
- 3 AREAS, I MEAN, WE'VE GOT TO HAVE COMPETENT PEOPLE.

- 5 DR. BRUCE CHERNOF: SUPERVISOR, YOU KNOW, WE DID NOT JUST TRUST
- 6 PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS FOR THE CONCERNS YOU RAISE, WHICH IS
- 7 PART OF WHY EVERY SINGLE PERSON WAS INTERVIEWED. WE TOOK TO
- 8 HEART TRAINING AND TESTING, WHICH HAS BEEN EXTRAORDINARY,
- 9 THOUSANDS OF HOURS OF HANDS-ON TESTING. NOT JUST TO HAVE
- 10 PEOPLE DESCRIBE HOW THEY WOULD DO SOMETHING BUT TO ACTUALLY
- 11 DEMONSTRATE IT. AND I CAN TELL YOU, IN THE HISTORY OF THE
- 12 ORGANIZATION, WE'VE NEVER DONE THAT WITH AN ENTIRE FACILITY
- 13 WERE, IN A VERY NARROW PERIOD OF TIME, EVERY SINGLE EMPLOYEE
- 14 HAD TO BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE HANDS-ON COMPETENCIES. THIS HAS
- 15 BEEN A VERY UNIQUE EXERCISE AND WE'VE HAD TO RESPOND TO
- 16 FINDINGS WHEN WE'VE HAD THEM AND TO DO OUR BEST TO PICK GOOD
- 17 PEOPLE TO RUN THE HOSPITAL WHILE KEEPING IT OPEN BECAUSE THE
- 18 OTHER OPTIONS ARE FUNCTIONALLY TO NOT RUN THE HOSPITAL. I
- 19 MEAN, THAT IS THE OTHER OPTION THAT WE FACE. AND, AS WE WENT
- 20 THROUGH THE INTERVIEW PROCESS AND TO SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY
- 21 AND TO SUPERVISOR MOLINA'S REQUEST, THIS WILL BE A MUCH MORE
- 22 INFORMED DISCUSSION, I THINK, WITH DATA IN FRONT OF US BECAUSE
- 23 IT'S HARD TO DISSECT THESE NUMBERS WITHOUT HAVING THEM PULLED
- 24 TOGETHER. WE'RE GLAD TO DO THAT. BUT PART OF WHY WE DIDN'T
- 25 SEND PEOPLE OFF TO HARBOR IS IT MADE A LOT MORE SENSE TO KEEP



- I FEWER PEOPLE IN AN EFFORT TO HAVE THE BEST PEOPLE AVAILABLE
- 2 AND PREPARED FOR SURVEY. SO I AGREE WITH YOUR CONCERNS AND
- 3 SENTIMENTS, WHICH IS WHY WE'VE DONE THE WORK THE WAY WE HAVE
- 4 AND I LOOK FORWARD TO BRINGING DATA FORWARD TOMORROW FOR
- 5 REVIEW.

6

7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ANY OTHER DISCUSSION?

8

9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS IS A RECEIVE AND FILE.

10

11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IT IS.

12

13 CLERK SACHI HAMAI: WE HAVE A MOTION BY SUPERVISOR MOLINA.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANY OBJECTION TO THAT
- 16 MOTION? IF NOT, UNANIMOUS VOTE ON THAT MOTION AND THEN WE'LL
- 17 RECEIVE AND FILE ITEM NUMBER 2. THANK YOU.

18

19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY. ITEM NUMBER 3.

20

- 21 SUP. KNABE: EXCUSE ME. THERE WAS ALSO A MOTION BY YOU AS
- 22 RELATED TO MEASURE B.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YES, THAT INCLUDES MY MOTION AND
- 2 MY AMENDMENT WHICH WAS VERBALLY AGREED TO BY EVERYONE THAT
- 3 IT'S THE LAST-IN, FIRST-OUT OR FIRST-IN.

4

5 SUP. KNABE: OR WHATEVER-- EXCESS DOLLARS.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: DON'T SPEND THE MEASURE B MONEY
- 8 EXCEPT AS A LAST RESORT.

9

10 SUP. KNABE: THAT WAS IN ADDITION TO MOLINA'S MOTION?

11

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YES, IT WAS. AND HOW ARE YOU GOING
- 13 TO HANDLE THAT? IS THAT GOING TO BE...

14

- 15 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE CLERK CAN MAKE SURE THAT IT'S REFERENCED
- 16 IN THE MINUTE ORDER.

17

18 CLERK SACHI HAMAI: WE'VE GOT-- I'VE GOT IT.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. THANK YOU. OKAY. ITEM
- 21 3.

- 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM 3 IS AN UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE
- 24 BUDGET. I'D LIKE TO DO THAT AS PART OF ITEM 6, IF I COULD.
- 25 ITEM 4 IS RECEIVE AND FILE ISSUES RAISED PUBLIC HEARINGS.



2 SUP. MOLINA: MOVE IT.

3

1

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. MOLINA MOVES.
- 5 ANTONOVICH SECONDS. THIS IS A RECEIVE AND FILE MOTION,
- 6 CORRECT?

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT.

9

10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO ORDERED.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ALL RIGHT. ITEM NUMBER 5 YOU'VE ALREADY
- 13 CONTINUED.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THAT WAS ITEM 3, WAS IT NOT?

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT WAS ITEM 4. ISSUES RAISED AT PUBLIC
- 18 HEARINGS. I WANT TO TAKE 3 AND 6 TOGETHER.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: HANG ON A SECOND. MY ISSUES RAISED
- 21 AT PUBLIC HEARING SAYS NUMBER 3. NUMBER 4 IS COUNTY COUNSEL
- 22 LITIGATION, COST MANAGEMENT. DO I HAVE AN EARLIER VERSION?

- 24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: MAYBE I HAVE A LATER VERSION-- I MEAN, AN
- 25 EARLIER VERSION.

23

24

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I THINK THIS IS A DRAFT COPY OF 2 3 THE AGENDA, SORRY. I THINK IT CHANGED. 4 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, IT'S 4. 6 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SO THAT WAS 4. 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM NUMBER 5 HAS ALREADY BEEN CONTINUED. I 9 10 BELIEVE THEY ACTED, DID THEY, SACHI, ON ITEM 5 ALREADY? TO 11 CONTINUE THAT? 12 13 CLERK SACHI HAMAI: YES, WE DID. 14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ALL RIGHT. IT'S ALREADY CONTINUED. ITEM NUMBER 15 16 6 IS THE CHANGE LETTER. AND WHAT I'D LIKE TO DO IS I HAVE ABOUT FIVE OR SIX SLIDES ON THE POWERPOINT, SO I'D LIKE TO DO 17 18 AN OVERVIEW OF THE CHANGE LETTER AND THEN WE'LL GO THROUGH 19 ITEM 6. 3 AND 6 WE'RE GOING TO DO TOGETHER. I'M DOING 3 RIGHT NOW BASICALLY. I JUST WANTED TO LET YOU KNOW THAT WE WILL GO 20 21 BACK TO ITEM 6, WHICH IS THE CHANGE LETTER, AND GO THROUGH IT. 22 THIS IS JUST A HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW. RIGHT. THAT'S THE

POWERPOINT. I'M GOING TO GO THROUGH THE POWERPOINT, HIGH LEVEL

OVERVIEW, AND THEN WE'LL GO TO 6 ON A MORE SYSTEMATIC BASIS.

THERE IS A REASON I WANT TO DO THIS. THE FIRST FOUR PAGES ARE

The Meeting Transcript of

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



- 1 GRAPHS THAT WE DISCUSSED WITH THE RATING AGENCIES TWO WEEKS
- 2 AGO IN JUNE AND I THINK IT'S REALLY IMPORTANT FOR THE PUBLIC
- 3 TO UNDERSTAND AND FOR PEOPLE TO KNOW HOW WELL THE BOARD OF
- 4 SUPERVISORS DOES ITS BUDGET BECAUSE WE ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR A
- 5 \$21.7 BILLION PROPOSED BUDGET AND IT MATTERS TO PEOPLE, I
- 6 THINK, THAT THAT MONEY IS SPENT WISELY. FORGET ABOUT THE
- 7 PROGRAMS THEMSELVES. ECONOMICALLY, LOS ANGELES COUNTY IS
- 8 REALLY IN VERY GOOD SHAPE COMPARED TO OTHER PARTS OF THE
- 9 COUNTRY. OUR ECONOMIC BASE IS VERY DIVERSIFIED. INTERNATIONAL
- 10 TRADE, TOURISM, MOTION PICTURE, TECHNOLOGY, BUSINESS. IN THE
- 11 EARLY '90S, WHEN WE HAD THE COLLAPSE OF THE ECONOMIC AND THE
- 12 REAL ESTATE, WE WERE OVERLY REPRESENTED IN AEROSPACE. WE TOOK
- 13 THAT HIT. THAT'S NO LONGER THE CASE. WE NOW HAVE FEW, IF ANY,
- 14 CORPORATE NATIONAL CORPORATE OFFICES OF MAJOR BUSINESS BUT WE
- 15 ARE VERY DIVERSIFIED, VERY STRONG SMALL BUSINESS REGION. THE
- 16 PROPERTY TAX OR REAL ESTATE IS CLEARLY SOMETHING THAT EVERYONE
- 17 IS CONCERNED ABOUT. NOT JUST HERE. WE'RE ALSO IN BETTER
- 18 CONDITION, WE THINK, HERE IN LOS ANGELES IN TERMS OF DEFAULTS,
- 19 IN TERMS OF THE VALUE OF PROPERTY THAN ELSEWHERE. BUT, BECAUSE
- 20 IT IS 61 PERCENT OF OUR LOCAL REVENUE, WE MONITOR THAT VERY
- 21 CAREFULLY. THESE THREE CHARTS ARE A 10-YEAR VIEW FOR THE
- 22 RATING AGENCIES OF THE CONDITION OF THE BUDGET. AND, IN 1997,
- 23 YOU CAN SEE, THIS SIMPLY MEASURES EXPENSES AGAINST REVENUES.
- 24 IN 1997, EXPENSES WERE EXCEEDING REVENUES. EXPENSES WERE
- 25 EXCEEDING REVENUES. AND, ACTUALLY, IN 1996, WE HAD A \$90



- 1 MILLION SHORTFALL IN THE MIDDLE OF THE YEAR BECAUSE OF AN
- 2 OVERPROJECTED FUND BALANCE. WHAT WE WERE TRYING TO DEMONSTRATE
- 3 TO THE RATING AGENCIES AND PARTICULARLY STANDARD AND POORS IS
- 4 THAT WE HAVE DEMONSTRATED, YEAR AFTER YEAR AFTER YEAR, THAT WE
- 5 ALL KNOW HOW TO MANAGE THE COUNTY'S RESOURCES AND, AS YOU CAN
- 6 SEE ON THIS CHART, SIMPLY, REVENUES FROM 2002 ON HAVE EXCEEDED
- 7 EXPENDITURES, RESULTING IN THIS FUND BALANCE EVERY YEAR. IN
- 8 '06, IT'S SOMETHING ABOVE \$2.7 BILLION, ALL FUNDS, AND A
- 9 RATHER LARGE UNRESERVED DESIGNATED FUND BALANCE. AND WE HAVE
- 10 MOVED, IN TERMS OF THE DISCRETION THAT YOU HAVE, FROM 3.3
- 11 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL BUDGET TO 16 PERCENT. AND THIS ONE IS, TO
- 12 ME, THE MOST INTERESTING CHART OF ALL. THIS SHOWS THE DEBT
- 13 SERVICE. AND LOS ANGELES, PER CAPITA, IS IN VERY GOOD SHAPE
- 14 NOW WITH RESPECT TO ITS DEBT SERVICE. BUT, IF YOU LOOK AT
- 15 2012, THE DEBT SERVICE FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES DROPS TO
- 16 ALMOST APPROXIMATELY \$100 MILLION. THAT MONEY WILL BE
- 17 AVAILABLE AT THAT TIME FOR THINGS SUCH AS THE COST OF RETIREE
- 18 HEALTH, IF IT'S NECESSARY FOR THAT PURPOSE, AND THIS WAS A
- 19 POINT I MADE TO THE RATING AGENCIES AND THEY ACTUALLY USED IN
- 20 THEIR FINAL STATEMENTS ABOUT THE CONDITION OF THE COUNTY. BUT,
- 21 IN A VERY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME, L.A. COUNTY WILL HAVE
- 22 VIRTUALLY NO DEBT. THAT DID RESULT, WE'RE HAPPY TO SAY, AND
- 23 THE TREASURER, RAY FORTNER, AUDITOR, AND I, STANDARD AND POORS
- 24 RAISED OUR LONG-TERM RATING TO DOUBLE A MINUS. I DID NOT
- 25 REALIZE THAT THAT IS THE FIRST TIME SINCE 1994 THAT THE COUNTY



- 1 HAS BEEN IN A DOUBLE A STATUS SO THIS IS A BIG DEAL TO US.
- 2 THERE AREN'T A LOT OF INDICES ABOUT HOW WELL YOU'RE DOING
- 3 FINANCIALLY BUT BOND RATING CERTAINLY ARE ONE OF THEM AND THIS
- 4 IS THE BEST RATING THAT WE'VE HAD IN 13 YEARS. AND THE REASONS
- 5 THAT THEY IDENTIFIED, AND THEY ALWAYS DO, THEY LOOK AT FIRST
- 6 AND FOREMOST IS THE GOVERNING BODY WILLING TO MAKE TOUGH
- 7 FISCAL DECISIONS WHEN NECESSARY? AND YOU HAVE DEMONSTRATED
- 8 THAT OVER AND OVER AGAIN IN YOUR MANAGEMENT OF THE BUDGET.
- 9 WHAT ARE OUR RESERVES? HOW MUCH OF THE BUDGET IS
- 10 DISCRETIONARY? HOW WELL DO WE MANAGE? ALL OF THOSE PAID OFF
- 11 THIS YEAR. NOW, WITH RESPECT TO THE CHANGE LETTER, WHERE ARE
- 12 WE? WHAT DO YOU HAVE UNDER ITEM NUMBER 6 COMPARED TO THE
- 13 PROPOSED BUDGET? WE'RE PROPOSING TO ADD \$535 MILLION TO THE
- 14 PROPOSED BUDGET. \$535 MILLION, ONLY 280 POSITIONS. SO IT'S A
- 15 VERY SMALL STAFF ADDITION, HALF A MILLION DOLLARS-- HALF A
- 16 BILLION DOLLARS, EXCUSE ME, IS ABOUT A 2-1/2 PERCENT INCREASE
- 17 IN THE BUDGET, FOR A TOTAL BUDGET OF 17.7-- I CAN'T READ THAT.
- 18 \$17.7 BILLION-- EXCUSE ME. \$21.7 BILLION, 102,000 STAFF. OF
- 19 THE \$385 MILLION THAT'S IN THE GENERAL FUND, HOW MUCH OF THAT
- 20 IS NEW? ONLY \$38 MILLION OF THAT IS NEW. AND WE'LL GO THROUGH
- 21 THIS UNDER ITEM 6. 57 MILLION IS CARRYOVER FUND BALANCE, WHICH
- 22 WE HAVE EVERY YEAR. ANOTHER 66 MILLION IS FUND BALANCE THAT
- 23 WE'RE USING FOR ONE-TIME PURPOSES. 38.7 MILLION IS NEW ONGOING
- 24 OBLIGATIONS. OF THE HALF A BILLION DOLLARS, 38.7 MILLION IS
- 25 ALL WE'RE PROPOSING TO ADD TO ONGOING OPERATIONS OF THE



- 1 COUNTY. AND THEN THERE'S 142 MILLION REVENUE OFFSET, PRIMARILY
- 2 IN MENTAL HEALTH, HOMELAND SECURITY AND 20 MILLION TO RUN THE
- 3 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS NEXT YEAR, WITH SOME MINISTERIAL
- 4 CHANGES THAT I'LL TALK ABOUT IN ITEM 6. WE TALKED ABOUT HEALTH
- 5 DEPARTMENT. AND, WITH RESPECT TO THE STATE, WE'RE ESTIMATING A
- 6 POTENTIAL IMPACT OF ABOUT \$13 MILLION NET RIGHT NOW. WE ARE
- 7 MONITORING WHAT GOES ON IN SACRAMENTO, OBVIOUSLY, BUT, AS THE
- 8 RATING AGENCIES POINTED OUT, WITH PROPOSITION 1-A PASSING, THE
- 9 EXPOSURE THAT LOCAL GOVERNMENT HAS TO SACRAMENTO HAS BEEN
- 10 DRAMATICALLY, DRAMATICALLY REDUCED. SO, WITH THAT, LET ME ASK
- 11 YOU TO TAKE A CLOSER LOOK AT ITEM 6, WHICH IS THE PROPOSED
- 12 CHANGE LETTER. ON PAGE 4, PAGE 4 OF ITEM NUMBER 6, \$57.5
- 13 MILLION IS CARRYOVER. ITEMS THAT WERE NOT COMPLETED CURRENT
- 14 YEAR, WE'RE ASKING THAT THEY BE ROLLED OVER AND THEN ADDED TO
- 15 NEXT YEAR'S BUDGET, SOME OF THE SMALLER ONES, THE ASSESSOR,
- 16 PERSONNEL SERVICES DIVISION OF THE BOARD, CONSUMER AFFAIRS,
- 17 HUMAN RESOURCES AND CAPITAL PROJECTS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN
- 18 COMPLETED. 32 MILLION ARE CAPITAL PROJECTS THAT WE'RE SIMPLY
- 19 ASKING YOU TO CARRYOVER. THEY WEREN'T COMPLETED. THE BOARD OF
- 20 SUPERVISORS HAS UNSPENT FUNDS, A MUCH SMALLER AMOUNT THAN IN
- 21 PRIOR YEARS. I WILL SAY THAT USED TO RUN IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD
- 22 OF 24, \$25 MILLION. ADMINISTRATOR WAREHOUSE, 5 MILLION,
- 23 REGIONAL TERRORISM. SO THOSE ARE PRETTY STRAIGHTFORWARD, THE
- 24 57.5 MILLION. THE NEXT CATEGORY IS USE OF ADDITIONAL FUND
- 25 BALANCE, \$66 MILLION. NOW, WE PROJECT, IN PROPOSED BUDGET, AND



- 1 WE'RE PROJECTING NOW, HOW MUCH MONEY WE THINK WE'LL HAVE LEFT
- 2 OVER AT THE END OF THIS CURRENT BUDGET YEAR. IN PROPOSED
- 3 BUDGET, THAT FIGURE WAS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF \$200 MILLION.
- 4 WE'RE ADDING-- WE'RE ASSUMING ANOTHER 123 MILLION.

5

6 SUP. MOLINA: WHICH PAGE ARE YOU ON? I'M LOST.

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: BOTTOM OF PAGE 4.

9

10 SUP. MOLINA: OH, YOU'RE STILL ON PAGE 4.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH. I'M AT THE BOTTOM, ADDITIONAL FUND
- 13 BALANCE. I'M JUST SAYING...

14

15 **SUP. MOLINA:** I HAVE 600...

16

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 66.4 MILLION.

18

19 SUP. MOLINA: AND YOU'RE ADDING HOW MUCH?

- 21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE'RE ASSUMING A TOTAL OF 123 MILLION
- 22 ADDITIONAL FUND BALANCE. 57 MILLION IS CARRYOVER. I COVERED
- 23 THAT. THE REMAINING AMOUNT, 66 MILLION, IS PROPOSED TO BE
- 24 SPENT AS IDENTIFIED ON PAGE 5. 25 MILLION FOR HIGH PRIORITY
- 25 CAPITAL PROJECTS.

25

The Meeting Transcript of The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors



1 SUP. MOLINA: WHAT HAPPENS TO THE REMAINING 57? 2 3 SUP. KNABE: THAT'S THE CARRYOVER. 4 5 SUP. MOLINA: I KNOW BUT WHERE DOES IT GO? 6 7 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WHICH REMAINING? 123... 9 SUP. KNABE: YOU'RE SPENDING 66 HERE BUT SHE'S ASKING ABOUT THE 10 11 57. 12 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH, THAT'S ON-- JUST GO TO THE TOP OF THE PAGE. 57 IS CARRYOVER. BOTTOM OF PAGE 3. 57.5 MILLION OF THAT 14 123 IS SIMPLY CARRYING OVER EXISTING PROJECTS THAT WILL GROW 15 16 ON TO FUND BALANCE. AND THEN THE REMAINING AMOUNT, 66 MILLION, FOR THE TOTAL OF 123 IS PROPOSED TO BE SPENT AS IDENTIFIED ON 17 18 PAGE 5. AND, OF THAT 66.4 MILLION, 25 MILLION FOR HIGH 19 PRIORITY CAPITAL PROJECTS, 10 MILLION FOR WATER QUALITY COMPLIANCE, 13-1/2 MILLION ONE-TIME FUNDING FOR VARIOUS 20 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS. WE'RE ADDING ANOTHER 10 MILLION FOR THE 21 22 HUMAN RESOURCES COMPONENT OF E.C.A.P.S. WE'RE PROPOSING, AT 23 YOUR BOARD'S DIRECTION, TO FUND THE SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM, 5.7 MILLION. AND A HALF A MILLION FOR CHILDCARE TRAINING 24

INSTITUTE. THAT'S HOW WE ARE PROPOSING THAT THAT FUND BALANCE-



- 1 ANTICIPATED FUND BALANCE BE SPENT AND, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF
- 2 SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM, THOSE ARE ALL ONE-TIME EXPENDITURES. AND
- 3 WE HAVE FUNDED THE SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM LAST YEAR OUT OF ONE-
- 4 TIME, THIS YEAR OUT OF ONE-TIME. SO IT'S OBVIOUSLY AN ISSUE
- 5 THAT WE NEED TO ADDRESS AT SOME POINT.

6

7 SUP. BURKE: WAS MONEY LEFT OVER FROM LAST YEAR?

8

9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, RIGHT.

10

- 11 SUP. BURKE: AND THAT'S ABOUT HOW MUCH? IS THAT PART OF THE
- 12 FUND BALANCE?

- 14 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH, 5.7. RIGHT. PART OF THE FUND BALANCE. AT
- 15 THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 5, 38.7 MILLION IS THE NEW GENERAL FUND
- 16 ONGOING REVENUE THAT WE'RE PROPOSING TO ALLOCATE. 38.7 OF THE
- 17 HALF A BILLION. WE'VE INCREASED THE ASSUMPTION ON PROPERTY TAX
- 18 FROM AN ASSESSMENT OF 6 PERCENT TO 7 PERCENT. WE DO NOT WANT
- 19 TO GO HIGHER THAN 7 PERCENT. IT'S PROBABLY A LITTLE HIGHER
- 20 THAN I WOULD HAVE LIKED. THE ASSESSOR IS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD
- 21 OF 9. WE WERE AT 12 CURRENT YEAR. SO IT'S GOING DOWN. NO
- 22 QUESTION ABOUT IT. WE'RE REDUCING OUR ASSUMPTIONS. BUT THIS
- 23 38.7 MILLION SIMPLY CAME FROM AN ASSUMPTION THAT WENT FROM 6
- 24 TO 7 PERCENT. 10 MILLION OF THAT 38.7 SET ASIDE FOR HIGH
- 25 PRIORITY PROJECTS. 7.2 MILLION WE'RE PROPOSING TO ADD BEDS TO



- 1 PITCHESS AND WE HAD THIS DISCUSSION EARLIER WITH THE BOARD. WE
- 2 HAVE A REPORT LATER ON TALKING FURTHER ABOUT PITCHESS. IT'S,
- 3 UNFORTUNATELY, A COMPLICATED ISSUE BUT WE'RE PROPOSING TO ADD
- 4 \$7.2 MILLION TO REOPEN ABOUT 240 BEDS I THINK AT PITCHESS.
- 5 CUSTODY MEDICAL SERVICES, WE TALKED ABOUT THIS IN PROPOSED.
- 6 YOUR BOARD INDICATED, AT THAT TIME THAT, WE NEEDED TO CONTINUE
- 7 THE MULTI-YEAR PROGRAM THAT YOU HAVE SUPPORTED IMPROVING
- 8 MEDICAL CONDITIONS AT THE JAILS. WE ADDED 10 MILLION TO DO
- 9 THAT. IT'S ACTUALLY, NOT TO GET TRICKY BUT IT'S ACTUALLY ONLY
- 10 COSTING US 5 MILLION BECAUSE PROPOSED BUDGET HAD 10 MILLION
- 11 FOR OUTPATIENT SERVICES AT THE GENERAL HOSPITAL. THE GENERAL
- 12 HOSPITAL IS NOT GOING TO OPEN IN THE FALL OF THIS YEAR. IT
- 13 WILL MORE LIKELY OPEN IN THE SPRING OF NEXT YEAR SO THEY DON'T
- 14 NEED A FULL YEAR FUNDING. SO WE SAVED OURSELVES \$5 MILLION
- 15 FROM PROPOSED. WE'RE ADDING 3.3 MILLION MORE FOR GANGS. THE
- 16 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, 13.6 MILLION NOW IS THE TOTAL ADDITIONAL
- 17 FUNDS BEING PROPOSED TO DEAL WITH GANGS IN SHERIFF, IN THE
- 18 DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. WE'RE ALSO PROPOSING TO ADD AN
- 19 ADDITIONAL 2.4 MILLION TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR
- 20 WORKLOAD INCREASES IN COURTS IN THE ANTELOPE VALLEY, COMPTON
- 21 AND VAN NUYS. PROPOSING TO ADD 1-1/2 MILLION DOLLARS TO
- 22 REGIONAL PLANNING, TO ENHANCE CUSTOMER SERVICE IN FIELD
- 23 OFFICES, CONDUCT COMMUNITY-BASED PUBLIC HEARINGS, IMPROVE
- 24 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND ENHANCE THE QUALITY OF PLANNING
- 25 SERVICES. PLANNING IS OBVIOUSLY A VERY IMPORTANT COMPONENT OF



- 1 UNINCORPORATED AREA SERVICES THAT WE PROVIDE TO THE OVER A
- 2 MILLION PEOPLE THAT LIVE IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREA. 1.5
- 3 MILLION FOR ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES. 1.7 MILLION FOR THE
- 4 ADDITIONAL COST TO MY OFFICE OF THE PROPOSED ORGANIZATION
- 5 STRUCTURE. SO THAT'S THE 38.7 MILLION OF NEW PROPOSALS. PAGE
- 6 7, REVENUE OFFSET. 3632. 16 MILLION FOR MENTAL HEALTH
- 7 SERVICES. M.H.S.A. PROP. 63 MONIES, \$12 MILLION. WE ANTICIPATE
- 8 RECEIVING 25 MILLION IN HOMELAND SECURITY GRANTS, \$20 MILLION
- 9 FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY NEXT YEAR. AND THEN THERE ARE A
- 10 NUMBER OF MINISTERIAL TRANSACTIONS, MOVING MONEY FROM ONE POT
- 11 TO ANOTHER, IF YOU WILL. WE'RE ADDING TO THE PROBATION OFFICE
- 12 AGAIN, TAKING IT OUT OF P.F.U., REDUCING THE AMOUNT THAT'S
- 13 REMAINING TO ABOUT 8-1/2 MILLION DOLLARS. MAY BE A LITTLE
- 14 DIFFERENT THAN THAT. SALARY INCREASES. AGAIN, WE'RE MOVING
- 15 MONEY TO COVER SALARY INCREASES. 2.7 MILLION FROM A
- 16 DESIGNATION TO FUND ADDITIONAL GANG, THE GANG PROGRAM IN THE
- 17 UNINCORPORATED AREA, WHICH YOUR BOARD APPROVED LAST YEAR AND
- 18 WANTED DONE AGAIN THIS YEAR. HEALTH DEPARTMENT, WE'VE TALKED
- 19 ABOUT THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT. THERE'S NOTHING ADDITIONAL THERE
- 20 I THINK THAT NEEDS TO BE MENTIONED. ON PAGE 11, WE HAVE
- 21 SPECIAL FUNDS. FIRE DEPARTMENT, FLOOD CONTROL, LIBRARY AND
- 22 CAPITAL PROJECTS. SO THERE ARE ABOUT 50 OR 60 ITEMIZED PAGES
- 23 OF ADDITIONS IN THE CHANGE LETTER THAT WE WOULD BE HAPPY TO
- 24 ANSWER QUESTIONS ABOUT BUT THE 38.7 MILLION IS THE NEW
- 25 ADDITIONAL ONGOING GENERAL FUND RECOMMENDATION. SO WE WOULD BE



- 1 HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU HAVE ABOUT ANY OF THE
- 2 DETAILS OF ITEM NUMBER 6.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. WHO WANTS TO START? MR.
- 5 KNABE?

6

- 7 SUP. KNABE: ON THE TRANSFER OF THE 2.7 MILLION ON THE GANG
- 8 TASKFORCE ON PAGE 8? DO WE HAVE-- IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING WE
- 9 DON'T HAVE A PLAN YET, IS THAT CORRECT? YOU KNOW, ONE OF THE
- 10 THINGS THAT I'VE NOTICED THAT THERE ARE 24 NEW C.O.P.S.
- 11 DEPUTIES BEING TRANSFERRED TO THIS PARTICULAR ASSIGNMENT BUT
- 12 THEY'RE JUST GOING TO COMPTON AND CENTURY AND LENNOX. AND WE'D
- 13 CERTAINLY LIKE TO SEE A PLAN AS IT RELATES TO ALL THE
- 14 UNINCORPORATED AREA.

15

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT AND THAT'S WHY THE MONEY IS IN P.F.U.
- 17 AND NOT IN THE SHERIFF'S BUDGET UNTIL THEY PROVIDE THAT PLAN
- 18 TO YOU.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHAT WAS THAT IN REFERENCE TO, I'M
- 21 SORRY?

22

23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE 2.7 MILLION UNINCORPORATED AREA GANG.

24

25 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: GO AHEAD.



1

- 2 SUP. KNABE: NO, I WAS JUST AS IT RELATED TO THE UNINCORPORATED
- 3 AREA AND THAT WAS A HUGE ISSUE FOR ALL OF US BUT WE HAVE NOT
- 4 YET SEEN A PLAN AND WE JUST SAW TRANSFER OF SOME FOLKS THAT--
- 5 PRETTY ISOLATED AS TO WHERE THEY WERE GOING AND WHAT THEY WERE
- 6 DOING, NOT THAT THEY WEREN'T NEEDED THERE BUT I WANT TO MAKE
- 7 SURE THE OTHER UNINCORPORATED AREAS ARE NOT OVERLOOKED. WE
- 8 HAVE NEEDS AND CONCERNS, TOO. SO WE'LL LOOK FORWARD TO THE
- 9 PLAN.

10

11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: CORRECT.

12

13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY. MR. ANTONOVICH?

14

- 15 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE C.I.O. IS RECEIVING AN ADDITIONAL \$1
- 16 MILLION FOR NEW POSITIONS. AT THE SAME TIME, SEVERAL OF OUR
- 17 COUNTY DEPARTMENTS ARE RECEIVING ADDITIONAL I.T. POSITIONS.
- 18 HOW WILL YOU MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S NO DUPLICATION OF
- 19 FUNCTIONS? AND, SPECIFICALLY, WHAT WOULD THE ADDITIONAL \$1
- 20 MILLION TO THE C.I.O. PROVIDE US? HOW DOES THAT DIFFER FROM
- 21 THE POSITIONS BEING ADDED THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY?

- 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THANK YOU. MR. CHAIRMAN, SUPERVISOR, YOU MAY
- 24 RECALL THAT YOUR BOARD COMMISSIONED A MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE
- 25 C.I.O.'S OFFICE. AND, AS PART OF THAT AUDIT, THEY RECOMMENDED



- 1 THAT WE ESTABLISH, CENTRALLY, A PROJECT MANAGEMENT FUNCTION IN
- 2 THE C.I.O.'S OFFICE. AND THAT'S WHAT THE PRIMARY USE OF THIS
- 3 MONEY IS, IS TO ADD STAFF AT THE CENTRAL OFFICE TO PROVIDE
- 4 PROJECT MANAGEMENT FOR SOME OF OUR LARGER, MORE IMPORTANT
- 5 UNDERTAKINGS. I THINK, IF I'M REMEMBERING CORRECTLY, THE
- 6 COUNTY SPENDS IN THE ORDER OF \$300 MILLION IN TECHNOLOGY IN
- 7 ALL DEPARTMENTS. THOSE ITEMS THAT WOULD BE ADDED IN DEPARTMENT
- 8 WOULD BE RELATED TO SPECIFIC DEPARTMENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS AND
- 9 WOULD NOT CERTAINLY THE INTENT IS THAT THEY NOT BE DUPLICATIVE
- 10 OF WHAT WE'RE DOING IN THE CENTRAL OFFICE BUT WE'RE BASICALLY
- 11 STRENGTHENING THE C.I.O.'S OFFICE BY ADDING THESE POSITIONS
- 12 AND THEIR ABILITY TO OVERSEE MAJOR PROJECTS IN THE COUNTY.

13

- 14 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WHEN THE-- WE CREATED THE DEPARTMENT OF
- 15 PUBLIC HEALTH, SEPARATED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, WE
- 16 WERE TOLD THAT IT WAS GOING TO BE REVENUE-NEUTRAL. NOW WE HAVE
- 17 AN INCREASE OF 55 POSITIONS AND \$20 MILLION TO THE NET COUNTY
- 18 COST. WHERE WAS THE DISCONNECT?

- 20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, THERE ARE A COUPLE OF THINGS GOING ON IN
- 21 THAT TRANSFER. ONE IS, WHEN THE TRANSFER WAS DONE, THE SHARE
- 22 OF ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS WAS NOT COMPLETED. SO PART OF THIS
- 23 IS RECOGNIZING THAT NOT ENOUGH POSITIONS WERE TRANSFERRED FROM
- 24 HEALTH TO PUBLIC HEALTH AS PART OF THE SEPARATION. THE OTHER
- 25 PART OF IT IS ONE WE REALLY, I THINK, HADN'T THOUGHT ABOUT AND



- 1 THAT WAS, WHEN YOU PULL PUBLIC HEALTH OUT OF THE HEALTH
- 2 DEPARTMENT, THEY DIDN'T TAKE ANY OF THE DEFICIT, IF YOU WILL,
- 3 OF THE DEPARTMENT WITH THEM. THE DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN IN
- 4 DEFICIT FOR MANY YEARS. WE DIDN'T ASSIGN...

5

6 SUP. ANTONOVICH: PUBLIC HEALTH HAS BEEN?

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH. WELL, WHOLE DEPARTMENT, RIGHT? AND
- 9 PUBLIC HEALTH...

10

11 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I KNOW BUT PUBLIC HEALTH...

12

- 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, BUT PUBLIC HEALTH IS PART OF THE
- 14 DEPARTMENT. WE NEVER SEPARATED THE TWO.

15

- 16 SUP. ANTONOVICH: BUT DOESN'T PUBLIC HEALTH RECEIVE THEIR FUND
- 17 BASICALLY FROM STATE OR FEDERAL?

- 19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO. WE NEVER PROVIDED GENERAL FUND TO THE
- 20 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, INCLUDING PUBLIC HEALTH, FOR SALARIES.
- 21 THIS IS A SALARY ISSUE NOW. FIRST IS ADMINISTRATION. NOW
- 22 SALARIES. SO WE SAT DOWN WITH DR. FIELDING, HE'S GOT THOUSANDS
- 23 OF EMPLOYEES NOW THAT ARE FUNDED BY THE STATE, FEDERAL AND
- 24 COUNTY GENERAL FUNDS AND SAID, "HOW AM I GOING TO PAY FOR THE
- 25 SALARY INCREASES YOU GUYS NEGOTIATED? I HAVE NOBODY I CAN



- 1 CHARGE THEM AGAINST, UNLIKE THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT. I CAN'T
- 2 BURY THEM IN THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S DEFICIT. I'M GOING TO
- 3 HAVE TO CUT PROGRAMS." AND WE DID NOT THINK THAT THAT WAS
- 4 ANYBODY'S INTENT THAT THE ACTUAL PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS BE
- 5 REDUCED, SO WE AGREED THAT THE GENERAL FUND, GOING FORWARD,
- 6 NEEDS TO PAY FOR THE INCREASED COSTS OF SALARIES AND BENEFITS.
- 7 SO THOSE ARE THE TWO PIECES. SO, AT THE TIME IT WAS SEPARATED,
- 8 YES, WE BELIEVE IT WAS REASONABLY REVENUE-NEUTRAL BUT, GOING
- 9 FORWARD, UNLESS YOU WANT PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAMS TO BE CUT, THE
- 10 GENERAL FUND NEEDS TO PROVIDE THAT. AND SO IT'S BEING TREATED
- 11 MORE LIKE PROBATION DEPARTMENT OR SHERIFF, ET CETERA.

12

- 13 SUP. KNABE: BUT THERE WERE OTHER ADDITIONAL COSTS AS IT
- 14 RELATED TO THAT CUTOFF FROM PUBLIC HEALTH THAT, I MEAN, IT WAS
- 15 SUPPOSED TO BE NO ADDITIONAL COSTS. ARE YOU SAYING THAT THE
- 16 ONLY COST ASSOCIATED WITH THAT SPLITTING OF THE DEPARTMENT IS
- 17 WITH THE SALARIES? BECAUSE SOME OF THE NUMBERS WE WERE LOOKING
- 18 AT, LIKE, THERE WAS SOME ADDITIONAL DOLLARS...

- 20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, WE MAY BE-- LET'S SEE. WHAT DOES THE
- 21 PUBLIC HEALTH BUDGET SHOW ON PAGE 30? ITEM NUMBER 2 ON PAGE
- 22 30. \$6.4 MILLION REFLECTS THE TRANSFER OF NET COUNTY COSTS
- 23 FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES TO CONTINUE THE
- 24 SEPARATION OF THE TWO DEPARTMENTS. THAT WAS THE ITEM I
- 25 REFERENCED ABOUT ADMINISTRATION. A.I.D.S., NOTHING THERE.



- 1 ALCOHOL AND DRUGS, NOTHING. PUBLIC HEALTH ANTELOPE VALLEY, NO.
- 2 RETIREE HEALTH ON PAGE 32. \$2.1 MILLION. THAT'S GENERAL FUND.
- 3 THAT'S ADDITIONAL. NURSE CLASSIFICATION STRUCTURE AND PAY
- 4 PLAN. THEY HAVE NURSES, AS WELL. THEY HAVE INCREASED COSTS.
- 5 \$9.9 MILLION IS THE ADDITIONAL COSTS THAT WE'RE PROPOSING. SO,
- 6 SUPERVISOR, ABOUT 12 MILLION OF THAT IS RELATED TO THE COST OF
- 7 SALARIES AND COST OF DOING BUSINESS AND THE REMAINDER IS THE
- 8 SEPARATION.

9

10 SUP. KNABE: SEPARATION.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AND I'M DELIGHTED TO SEE THAT OUR
- 13 DOCUMENTATION...

14

- 15 SUP. KNABE: I MEAN, IS ANY PART OF THAT DEBT SERVICE? I MEAN,
- 16 IS THERE ANY DEBT SERVICE RELATED TO ALL THAT, YOU KNOW, AS
- 17 FAR AS ANYTHING ON THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT SIDE OR IS IT
- 18 STRICTLY JUST OPERATIONAL? JUST STRICTLY OPERATIONAL?

19

20 C.A.O. JANSSEN: JUST OPERATIONAL. NO DEFICIT. NO DEBT SERVICE.

21

22 SUP. KNABE: THAT'S ALL I HAVE, ZEV.

- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER DISCUSSION?
- 25 MS. BURKE?



- 2 SUP. BURKE: I JUST HAVE A FEW QUESTIONS. ON THE SELF-HELP
- 3 LEGAL ACCESS CENTERS, WE'RE VERY SUPPORTIVE OF THAT. HOWEVER,
- 4 WE HAVE SO MUCH NEED OF ADDITIONAL SERVICES AND IT APPEARS
- 5 THAT WE DON'T GET QUITE THE SAME AMOUNT THAT OTHER DISTRICTS
- 6 GET AND MY UNDERSTANDING WAS THAT TWO THINGS HAPPENED. FIRST
- 7 OF ALL, THAT OUR CENTERS ARE SMALL WHERE OTHERS ARE MAYBE
- 8 LARGE. BUT OUR NEED IS TO INCREASE THOSE SMALL ONES INTO OTHER
- 9 COURTS AND I WOULD HOPE THAT YOU'D LOOK AT THAT IN TERMS OF
- 10 TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT WE CAN HAVE THE ALLOCATIONS. NOW,
- 11 ANOTHER THING, OF COURSE, IS THAT THERE IS ONE AGENCY THAT ALL
- 12 OF THE SELF-HELP CENTERS HAVE TO REPORT TO AND SOME OF OUR
- 13 CENTERS FEEL THAT THEY SHOULD NOT HAVE TO REPORT TO A CENTER,
- 14 TO THIS AGENCY THAT'S SO FAR REMOVED FROM THEM, THAT THEY
- 15 WOULD PREFER TO BE ABLE TO OPERATE AS THEY DID BEFORE, WHERE
- 16 THEY DID NOT HAVE TO REPORT TO THAT CENTER. BUT I WOULD HOPE
- 17 THAT YOU WOULD LOOK AT THE FUNDING COUNTYWIDE AND IT MAY BE
- 18 THAT THERE ARE SOME AREAS WHERE YOU HAVE ADDITIONAL COURTS
- 19 THAT ARE TREMENDOUSLY IN NEED. NOW, WE PUT OUR DISCRETIONARY
- 20 IN JUST LIKE OTHER SUPERVISORS DO, PUT THEIR DISCRETIONARY
- 21 INTO THOSE OTHER SELF-HELP CENTERS BUT, AT THE SAME TIME,
- 22 THERE'S A LIMIT TO HOW MUCH DISCRETIONARY WE CAN PUT IN WHEN
- 23 WE REALIZE WE HAVE AT LEAST TWO COURTS THAT REALLY NEED THOSE
- 24 SERVICES. I WOULD HOPE THAT YOU WOULD LOOK AT THAT AND GET
- 25 SOME ABILITY TO COORDINATE THE AMOUNTS.



1

- 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE'LL TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AND REPORT BACK ON
- 3 IT. AS YOU KNOW, THE COUNTY SPENDS \$1.8 MILLION...

4

5 SUP. BURKE: IS THAT COUNTYWIDE?

6

- 7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S FOR ALL COURTS. \$1.8 MILLION, 600,000
- 8 OF WHICH ARE FROM BOARD DISCRETIONARY FUNDS.

9

10 SUP. BURKE: RIGHT. AND HOW MANY CENTERS ARE BEING FUNDED?

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THERE ARE NINE CENTERS ON MY LIST HERE.
- 13 POMONA, ENGLEWOOD, VAN NUYS, LONG BEACH, ANTELOPE VALLEY, SAN
- 14 FERNANDO, SANTA MONICA, VAN NUYS, TORRANCE.

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE: IN PREVIOUS ALLOCATIONS, WAS A LOT OF THAT FOR
- 17 STARTUP MONEY?

- 19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I THINK EACH ONE VARIED AND THEY VARIED
- 20 PROBABLY BECAUSE, FRANKLY, I DIDN'T RECOMMEND ANY OF THEM.
- 21 IT'S A DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM OF THE BOARD. IT IS AN OBLIGATION
- 22 OF THE SUPERIOR COURT IF ANYONE. SO, WHEN WE STARTED, IT WAS,
- 23 I THINK, SUPERVISOR YAROSLAVSKY, I THINK, CAME IN WITH THE
- 24 FIRST CENTER AND IT WAS-- I THINK IT WAS-- VAN NUYS WAS THE
- 25 FIRST ONE.



1

- 2 SUP. BURKE: WELL, WE HAD A CENTER BUT IT WAS BEING PAID FOR
- 3 TOTALLY BY-- SEE, OUR SITUATION WAS DIFFERENT. THERE WAS A
- 4 CENTER BUT THE FUNDS, I BELIEVE, CAME FROM THE STATE. SO, WHEN
- 5 THE STATE PULLED THEIR FUNDS OUT, WE HAD TO FUND IT WITH OUR
- 6 DISCRETIONARY TOTALLY.

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY. THE 122,000?

9

10 SUP. BURKE: YES.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH. WELL, WE WILL TAKE A LOOK AT ALL OF
- 13 THAT. I'M NOT SURE EXACTLY WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT IT BUT WE WILL
- 14 TAKE A LOOK AT IT. THE REPORTING REQUIREMENT I HADN'T HEARD
- 15 BEFORE BUT WE'LL TAKE A LOOK AT THAT AND REPORT BACK.

16

17 **SUP. BURKE:** OKAY.

18

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, JUST MAKE SURE THAT...

20

- 21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I UNDERSTAND, YES. WE'RE GOING TO MOVE IT OUT
- 22 OF THE THIRD DISTRICT TO THE SECOND DISTRICT BECAUSE...

- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: DON'T PUNISH US FOR USING OUR
- 25 DISCRETIONARY MONEY TO DO IT. IT'S A GOOD PROGRAM AND IT OUGHT



- 1 TO BE FUNDED, FRANKLY, COUNTYWIDE AND IT'S HAD-- I MEAN, THE
- 2 RETURN WE GET ON THIS VERY MODEST INVESTMENT IS HUGE.

3

4 SUP. BURKE: RIGHT.

5

- 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ABSOLUTELY HUGE. I MEAN, THE
- 7 NUMBERS OF PEOPLE WHO AVAIL THEMSELVES OF THIS SERVICE, WE
- 8 OUGHT TO INCREASE IT TENFOLD. I MEAN, IT'S JUST UNBELIEVABLE
- 9 IN ALL OF THE CENTERS OUT THERE. PEOPLE ARE THIRSTING FOR THIS
- 10 ACCESS TO OUR JUDICIAL SYSTEM AND TO THE JUSTICE SYSTEM AND
- 11 THEY'RE UNABLE TO REPRESENT THEMSELVES IN THIS SORT OF UNIQUE
- 12 PROGRAM TO GET ACCESS TO THE COURTS IN A WAY THAT OTHERWISE
- 13 THEY HAVE TO PAY \$300, \$400 AN HOUR TO AN ATTORNEY, WHICH NONE
- 14 OF THESE CONSTITUENTS OF OURS CAN REMOTELY AFFORD. SO IT'S A
- 15 GREAT PROGRAM COUNTYWIDE. BUT, AS YOU LOOK AT IT, APPLES TO
- 16 APPLES, I MEAN, I WOULD HAVE NO OBJECTION TO INCREASING THE
- 17 OVERALL COUNTYWIDE INVESTMENT IN THIS PROGRAM TO A MUTUALLY
- 18 AGREED UPON LEVEL BUT DON'T PUNISH US FOR HAVING INVESTED...

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE: WELL, WE HAD TO PUT THE MONEY FROM DISCRETIONARY
- 21 BECAUSE THERE WAS NO MONEY AT ALL AVAILABLE.

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, SO DID WE. WELL, BUT IT'S
- 24 AVAILABLE NOW, I MEAN, AND IT'S-- I MEAN...



1 SUP. BURKE: NOT FOR THESE CENTERS.

2

- 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I THINK THERE'S A SHLACK IN EVERY-
- 4 A CENTER IN EVERY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT NOW.

5

- 6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: FIRST, SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH, FIFTH. YES,
- 7 THERE IS ONE IN EACH.

8

- 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I MEAN, IT STARTED IN OUR DISTRICT
- 10 BUT IT MOVED VERY QUICKLY ALL OVER.

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IN ENGLEWOOD, THERE'S ONLY \$122,000 IN
- 13 ENGLEWOOD, FOR EXAMPLE, I THINK THAT'S WHAT YOUR YOU'RE
- 14 TALKING ABOUT. SANTA MONICA-- NOT SANTA MONICA, EXCUSE ME, VAN
- 15 NUYS IS 313,000. POMONA, 240, LONG BEACH, 200, ANTELOPE
- 16 VALLEY, 189. SO THERE IS A DIFFERENTIAL IN THE AMOUNT OF
- 17 MONEY. I'M NOT SURE IF THAT'S RELATED TO STAFFING.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: BUT WE'RE MAKING UP THE DIFFERENCE
- 20 OF THE DIFFERENTIAL WITH OUR-- ON THE DISCRETIONARY FUND.

21

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S WHAT I'M ASSUMING. THE REST OF IT. WE
- 23 NEED TO LOOK AT THE WHOLE PACKAGE. RIGHT. BECAUSE THERE IS
- 24 DISCRETIONARY MONEY BEING PUT...



- 1 SUP. BURKE: SEE, BUT, IN COMPTON, I'M HAVING TO PAY THE WHOLE
- 2 THING, I THINK, 130...

3

4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I DON'T EVEN SHOW COMPTON ON MY LIST.

5

6 SUP. BURKE: I KNOW BECAUSE WE PAY FOR IT.

7

8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: BUT IT SHOULD BE HERE THOUGH.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IT STILL SHOULD SHOW UP ON THE
- 11 LIST.

12

13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT STILL SHOULD BE ON THE LIST.

14

15 **SUP. BURKE:** YEAH.

16

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: SO COMPTON?

18

19 SUP. BURKE: WELL, SEE, THAT'S WHAT I WAS EXPLAINING.

20

21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S BRAND NEW.

- 23 SUP. BURKE: IT WAS STATE MONEY THAT WAS FUNDING IT. THE STATE
- 24 PULLED THEIR MONEY OUT. THE COUNTY DID NOT PUT ANY MONEY IN SO
- 25 WE HAD TO PUT IT IN FROM OUR DISCRETIONARY.



1 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AND HOW MUCH IS THAT? 3 SUP. BURKE: WE PUT 130. 4 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 130, OKAY. THERE ARE... 6 7 8 SUP. BURKE: THAT'S WHY-- WE'D LIKE TO MEET WITH YOU, GO THROUGH IT. 10 11 SUP. KNABE: THEY'RE OUTSTANDING PROGRAMS, I'LL TELL YOU THAT. 12 13 SUP. BURKE: THEY'RE VERY IMPORTANT. IN PLACES WHERE PEOPLE HAVE VERY LITTLE FUNDS, IT REALLY MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF 14 DIFFERENCE. I'D LIKE TO ASK A QUESTION ON PAGE 9 ON THE HARBOR 15 16 HOSPITAL BUNGALOWS. THAT'S SOMETHING THAT'S REALLY NEEDED. THAT'S THE D.M.H. TO REPLACE EXISTING BUNGALOWS AND YOU 17 18 ALLOCATED 2.5 MILLION? ON PAGE 9? OUR UNDERSTANDING IS THAT 19 THE CURRENT ESTIMATE IS 5.7 TO COMPLETE THE PROJECT. HOW DO WE 20 ANTICIPATE THAT WILL WORK? 21 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THEY'RE TWO PROJECTS, I'M TOLD. THE TWO AND A 23 HALF MILLION IS ALL WE NEED TO REPLACE THE BUNGALOWS. THE FIVE

SEVEN IS A NEW PROJECT AND IT WILL BE TAKING A LOOK AT AS A

25 NEW PROJECT.



1

2 SUP. BURKE: IT'S A NEW PROJECT EVEN THOUGH IT'S IN THE SAME

3 BUNGALOW? IT'S NOT IN THE SAME BUNGALOW?

4

5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT'S NOT THE SAME BUNGALOW.

6

- 7 SUP. BURKE: IT'S NOT IN THE SAME BUNGALOW? OH, IT'S ONE
- 8 BUNGALOW. BUT YOU ARE GOING TO BIFURCATE IT. A NEW PROGRAM,
- 9 RIGHT. SO THE 5.7 IS SOMEWHERE? YOU'RE REVIEWING IT.

10

- 11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, IT'S NOT ANYWHERE. IT'S NOT IN THE BUDGET,
- NO. THE 2-1/2 MILLION IS IN THE BUDGET, THE 5.7 IS NOT.

13

- 14 SUP. BURKE: YOU KNOW, OUR STAFF SAYS THAT THE BUNGALOWS HAVE
- 15 BEEN NEEDED TO REPLACE FOR SEVEN YEARS SO...

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THEN THEY'RE JUST RIGHT AT THE RIGHT TIME
- 18 BECAUSE, IN THE EIGHTH YEAR, WE REPLACE EVERYTHING.

19

- 20 SUP. BURKE: SO, AS YOU'RE REVIEWING THE REST OF THE MONEY FOR
- 21 THE PROJECT, REMEMBER, IT'S BEEN SEVEN YEARS. I JUST WANT TO
- 22 GO TO ONE THING ON PAGE 6 ON THE ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES
- 23 POSITIONS AND THAT'S A NEW PILOT PROGRAM. HOW MANY POSITIONS
- 24 ARE GOING TO BE ALLOCATED TO THAT PROGRAM?



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS DOESN'T SHOW ANY POSITIONS.

2

3 SUP. BURKE: OKAY.

4

- 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I DON'T KNOW IF CYNTHIA IS HERE. DEBBIE, HOW
- 6 ARE THEY PROPOSING TO DO THE WORK? AND DOES NOT THE STATE
- 7 HAVE-- THE STATE ALSO IS PROVIDING, AT LEAST IN CONFERENCE
- 8 COMMITTEE, THEY'RE PROVIDING ADDITIONAL MONEY, AS WELL. BUT
- 9 IT'S FOR...

10

11 SUP. BURKE: I THOUGHT IT WAS FOR POSITIONS.

12

- 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ...A DIFFERENT AGE GROUP. WHY ARE THERE NO
- 14 POSITIONS ON...?

15

- 16 SUP. BURKE: WELL, AS THOSE NEW POSITIONS COME IN FROM THE
- 17 STATE, WOULD YOU CONSIDER PUTTING THEM NOT ONLY IN CONSUMER
- 18 AFFAIRS BUT ALSO IN THE SENIOR SERVICES? AND I GUESS THE ISSUE
- 19 IS YOU HAVE THOSE TWO PROGRAMS THAT ARE WORKING AND YOU'RE
- 20 LOOKING AT CONSOLIDATING THEM?

21

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. WE WILL REPORT BACK TO YOU ON THAT,
- 23 YES, BEFORE WE DO ANYTHING ON BOTH OF THEM.

24

25 SUP. BURKE: ALL RIGHT, GREAT.



1

- 2 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AND ON THE PROGRAM AND THEN THE PROPER
- 3 LOCATION AND THEN WHERE THE MONEY'S ALLOCATED IN.

4

- 5 SUP. BURKE: AND ALSO THE ALLOCATION OF THE STATE FUNDS WHEN
- 6 THEY COME IN, YES?

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE MILLION 5 WAS TO COVER THE FEDERAL
- 9 DISALLOWANCE. THAT'S TO KEEP THE PROGRAM WHERE IT IS, RIGHT.

10

11 SUP. BURKE: AND THEN THE STATE MONEY WILL COME IN.

12

- 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE STATE MONEY WILL BE ADDITIONAL. WE'LL HAVE
- 14 TO COME BACK TO YOU WITH THAT.

15

16 SUP. BURKE: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I HAVE NO OTHER QUESTIONS.

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: AND WE WILL.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: NO OTHER QUESTIONS. ANY OTHER
- 21 QUESTIONS? YES. IF NOT, IS THERE AN ACTION REQUIRED HERE ON 6?

22

- 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES. YOU HAVE TO APPROVE IT. YOU HAVE TO ADOPT
- 24 THE CHANGES AND THEN AUTHORIZE THE FUNDING AGREEMENT.



1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MR. ANTONOVICH MOVES.

2

- 3 SUP. ANTONOVICH: VOTE "NO" ON THE 1.7 MILLION FOR GOVERNANCE
- 4 STRUCTURE AND "NO" ON THE \$500,000 FOR THE NEEDLE EXCHANGE
- 5 PROGRAM.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. MS. MOLINA MOVES, I
- 8 WILL SECOND. WITH THOSE NOTED "NO" VOTES BY MR. ANTONOVICH,
- 9 WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THOSE "NO" VOTES THAT HE SHOULD BE
- 10 RECORDED ON AS "NO" VOTES, THE REST OF THEM WILL BE UNANIMOUS
- 11 VOTES.

12

- 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THANK YOU. ALL RIGHT. ITEM NUMBER 7, THE BOARD
- 14 OF SUPERVISORS REVISIONS, ADDITIONS, CHANGES TO THE BUDGET AS
- 15 PROPOSED. SO THIS IS YOUR ITEM.

16

17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: NUMBER 11?

18

- 19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WE'RE AT NUMBER 7. THESE ARE FOR BOARD MOTIONS
- 20 FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE BUDGET.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MR. ANTONOVICH, DO YOU WANT TO
- 23 START?



- 1 SUP. ANTONOVICH: YEAH. I WOULD LIKE TO-- THE ISSUE OF ILLEGAL
- 2 FOOD VENDORS IS A COUNTYWIDE PROBLEM, AFFECTING OUR 88 CITIES
- 3 AND 134 UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITIES. THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC
- 4 HEALTH HAS THE RESPONSIBILITY TO ENFORCE AND INVESTIGATE
- 5 CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODES IN ALL MOBILE FOOD VEHICLES
- 6 IN THE COUNTY, INCLUDING ILLEGAL FOOD VENDORS. RECENT STUDIES
- 7 HAVE SHOWN THAT NEGATIVE IMPLICATIONS MAY BE CREATED BY
- 8 CITIZENS CONSUMING FOOD PREPARED UNDER UNSANITARY CONDITIONS
- 9 OR UNSAFE FOOD PRACTICES. MANY OF THE VENDORS HAVE LACKED THE
- 10 APPROPRIATE HEALTH PERMITS AND DO NOT PRACTICE ADEQUATE
- 11 HYGIENE WHEN PREPARING THE FOOD, INCLUDING -- AND FRUIT. THOUGH
- 12 ILLEGAL FOOD VENDOR SWEEPS ARE CONDUCTED, LIMITED RESOURCES
- 13 AND LACK OF STAFFING HAVE HINDERED THE AMOUNT NECESSARY TO
- 14 CURB THIS THREAT. SO I'D MOVE THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE C.A.O.
- 15 TO TRANSFER \$80,000 FROM THE PROVISIONAL FUNDING USES BUDGET
- 16 TO PUBLIC HEALTH FOR INCREASE ILLEGAL VENDOR SWEEPS ON
- 17 EVENINGS AND WEEKENDS THROUGHOUT THE ANTELOPE VALLEY AND
- 18 \$90,000 FROM THE PROVISIONAL FINANCE USE BUDGET TO PUBLIC
- 19 HEALTH FOR A VEHICLE TO TRANSPORT ILLEGAL VENDING CARTS.

21 SUP. BURKE: I'LL SECOND THAT.

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. THERE'S A MOTION AND A
- 24 SECOND. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION? WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS
- 25 VOTE.

20



1

- 2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THEN L.A. COUNTY HAS THE HIGHEST
- 3 CONCENTRATION OF SENIORS IN OUR STATE. THE COMMUNITY SERVICES
- 4 DEPARTMENT CURRENT NUTRITION PROGRAM IS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE
- 5 ONE MEAL PER DAY FOR SENIORS 60 AND OLDER IN LA. COUNTY. THERE
- 6 ARE CURRENTLY TWO NUTRITION PROGRAMS AND THESE PROVIDE ABOUT
- 7 2.1 MILLION MEALS PER YEAR. THE COUNTY PROVIDES ABOUT 1.3
- 8 MILLION CONGREGATE MEALS ARE SERVED ANNUALLY AT ROUGHLY 110
- 9 SITES. THE COUNTY PROVIDES ABOUT 800,000 HOME DELIVERS TO 130
- 10 ROUTES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTY. ACCORDING TO A SURVEY CONDUCTED
- 11 IN APRIL, THE COUNTY HAS APPROXIMATELY 600 SENIORS ON A
- 12 WAITING LIST OF FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING FOR THE MEALS THAT
- 13 BASICALLY REMAIN AT THE SAME LEVEL. THE COSTS HAVE INCREASED.
- 14 SO I'D MOVE THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE C.A.O. TO REPORT BACK IN
- 15 60 DAYS TO DEVELOP A PLAN TO ADDRESS THE SENIOR MEAL PROGRAM
- 16 ON A COUNTYWIDE BASIS, WORKING WITH FEDERAL STATE ADVOCATES TO
- 17 PROVIDE COSTS OF DOING BUSINESS ADJUSTMENTS THAT ELIMINATE THE
- 18 WAITING LIST.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I'LL SECOND IT. IS THERE ANY
- 21 DISCUSSION? IF NOT, WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 23 SUP. ANTONOVICH: WILLIAM S. HART, WHO WAS THE SILENT SCENE
- 24 ACTOR AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CENTURY IN THE 1920S
- 25 COMMISSIONED ARTHUR KELLY TO BUILD HIM A MANSION IN NEWHALL.



- 1 WHEN HE DIED, HE LEFT THE HOME AND SURROUNDING LAND TO THE
- 2 COUNTY TO BE OPERATED AND MAINTAINED AS A PUBLIC PARK AND
- 3 MUSEUM. THE 260-ACRE ESTATES ARE OPERATED BY THE COUNTY
- 4 DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION. HART'S MANSION IS OPERATED
- 5 AS A MUSEUM BY THE L.A. COUNTY MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY. THE
- 6 MUSEUM HAS AN IMPRESSIVE COLLECTION OF WESTERN THEME ART, IT
- 7 HOLDS OIL PAINTINGS, WATER COLORS, INK DRAWINGS AND BRONZE
- 8 SCULPTURES DONE BY CHARLES RUSSELL, JOE D. YOUNG, CHARLES
- 9 KRISTADORRO AND FREDERICK REMINGTON. ALONG WITH THIS, THE
- 10 MUSEUM CONTAINS COUNTLESS MOVIE PROPS FROM THE 1920S AND
- 11 AUTHENTIC NATIVE INDIAN ARTIFACTS. OVER THE YEARS, THOUGH, THE
- 12 MANSION AND ITS COLLECTIONS HAVE DETERIORATED. I WOULD MOVE
- 13 THAT THE BOARD ALLOCATE \$200,000 TO THE MUSEUM OF NATURAL
- 14 HISTORY TO BE USED FOR COLLECTION AND CONSERVATION PROJECTS. 1
- 15 MILLION TO THE EXTRAORDINARY MAINTENANCE BUDGET OF THE
- 16 DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION TO COVER DEFERRED
- 17 MAINTENANCE PROJECTS AT THE WEYMOUTH HART MUSEUM FROM THE
- 18 FIFTH DISTRICT VARIOUS CAPITAL PROJECTS ACCOUNTS.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SECONDED BY MS. BURKE.
- 21 IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION? WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS MUSEUM IS REALLY A TREASURE FOR THE
- 24 COUNTY. I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY PEOPLE ACTUALLY KNOW THAT IT
- 25 EXISTS BUT IT'S JUST A WONDERFUL MUSEUM, JUST WONDERFUL.



- 2 SUP. ANTONOVICH: OH, YEAH, THE REMINGTON AND OTHER ART WORKS
- 3 THAT ARE THERE. LAST ONE IS, OFTENTIMES, COUNTY RESIDENTS
- 4 APPROACH THE BOARD WITH COMPLAINTS ABOUT THE DEPARTMENT OF
- 5 CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES, WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN RAISED
- 6 DURING DEPENDENCY COURT HEARINGS AND WHICH MAY HAVE INFLUENCED
- 7 THE COURT'S DECISION IN A PARTICULAR CASE. ALTHOUGH THE BOARD
- 8 DOES HOLD THE DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTABLE FOR FAILURE TO
- 9 APPROPRIATELY APPLY CHILD WELFARE LAWS AND CASE MANAGEMENT,
- 10 THE BOARD DOES NOT INTERVENE IN THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO
- 11 DEPENDENCY COURT, DOES NOT DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT TO MAKE A
- 12 PARTICULAR DECISION IN ANY INDIVIDUAL CASE AND CANNOT CHANGE
- 13 COURT ORDERS YET THE NEED REMAINS TO ENSURE GREATER
- 14 ACCOUNTABILITY TO COUNTY RESIDENTS WHO APPEAL TO THE BOARD. IN
- 15 AUGUST 2002, OUR BOARD UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED A MOTION THAT
- 16 DIRECTED THE DEPARTMENT TO EXAMINE A NEW MECHANISM TO ACHIEVE
- 17 AN OBJECTIVE REVIEW OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS CONCERNING THE
- 18 COUNTY'S HANDLING OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECTED CASES. THIS
- 19 INCLUDED THE POSSIBILITY OF RESTRUCTURING THE CHILDREN'S GROUP
- 20 HOME OMBUDSMAN'S OFFICE, WHICH IS LOCATED WITHIN THE OFFICE OF
- 21 THE AUDITOR CONTROLLER AND TAKES COMPLAINTS FROM YOUTH IN
- 22 GROUP HOMES. THE RESTRUCTURED OMBUDSMAN OFFICE WAS TO INCLUDE
- 23 AT LEAST ONE IN EACH DISTRICT THEIR SERVICE PLANNING AREA WHO
- 24 WOULD REVIEW THESE MATTERS AND RESPOND TO THE FAMILIES IN A
- 25 TIMELY, RESPECTFUL, UNBIASED MANNER. IN 2002, THE DEPARTMENT



- 1 CREATED A CENTRALIZED OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN UTILIZING
- 2 EXISTING DEPARTMENT'S PERSONNEL. IN 2005, THE DEPARTMENT
- 3 REDIRECTED THOSE PERSONNEL TO PERFORMING OTHER DUTIES WITHIN
- 4 THE DEPARTMENT AND, TODAY, THE COUNTY DOES NOT HAVE AN OFFICE
- 5 OF THE CHILDREN'S SERVICE OMBUDSMAN THAT IS ADMINISTRATIVELY
- 6 SEPARATED FROM STAFF PROVIDING SERVICES TO FAMILIES TO REVIEW
- 7 CITIZEN COMPLAINTS, MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE OR
- 8 SYSTEMATIC CHANGE SPECIFICALLY SEPARATING OUT AND
- 9 COLLABORATING WITH DEPENDENCY COURT ON IMPROVING THOSE
- 10 CIRCUMSTANCES IMPACTED BY THE QUALITY OF LEGAL REPRESENTATION.
- 11 I MOVE THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE C.A.O. TO, IN CONSULTATION
- 12 WITH THE COUNTY COUNCIL, REPORT BACK IN 30 DAYS ON THE
- 13 FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING AN INDEPENDENT OFFICE OF THE
- 14 CHILDREN'S SERVICES OMBUDSMAN WITH A CLEAR CHAIN OF COMMAND
- 15 UTILIZING EXISTING QUALIFIED STAFF WITHIN THE DEPARTMENTS OF
- 16 CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES AND THE AUDITOR CONTROLLER.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SECONDED BY MS. MOLINA,
- 19 WITHOUT OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS VOTE.

20

21 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THANK YOU.

22

23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MS. BURKE?



- 1 SUP. BURKE: I'LL PASS OUT A MOTION. SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH
- 2 INTRODUCED A MOTION ON THE CONGREGATE MEALS AND ALSO HOME-
- 3 DELIVERED MEALS ASKING THE C.A.O. TO COME BACK WITH ACTUALLY A
- 4 PLAN FOR MAKING THESE AVAILABLE TO ALL OF THE PEOPLE ON THE
- 5 WAITING LIST. I HAVE A MOTION THAT IS A LITTLE BIT DIFFERENT
- 6 THAT, IN THE EVENT THE COUNTY DOES NOT PICK UP THE COST ON
- 7 THOSE MEALS, I WOULD MOVE-- AND I'LL GIVE THE EXACT AMOUNT--
- 8 THAT WE ELIMINATE THE WAITING LIST FOR CONGREGATE MEALS
- 9 PROGRAM AND ALLOCATE FROM MY DISCRETIONARY \$68,859 AND
- 10 ELIMINATE WAITING LISTS FOR HOME DELIVERED MEALS IN THE AMOUNT
- OF \$132,000 OR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF 591 WHICH IS A TOTAL-- I'M
- 12 SORRY, THE TOTAL IS \$201,450 TO ELIMINATE THE WAITING LIST,
- 13 EVEN THOUGH I REALLY WOULD HOPE THAT THE COUNTY PICKS THIS UP.
- 14 BUT, IN THE EVENT THEY DO NOT UNDER MR. ANTONOVICH'S MOTION, I
- 15 WOULD SO MOVE. THAT'S A VERY BAD POLICY WHAT I'M DOING,
- 16 THOUGH. I HAVE NO INTENTION OF TAKING EVERYBODY OFF THE HOOK
- 17 ON THIS BUT IT'S A FALLBACK POSITION. SO I'LL MOVE.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECOND BY MR. ANTONOVICH. WITHOUT
- 20 OBJECTION. UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 22 SUP. BURKE: I HAVE ANOTHER MOTION. GIVEN THE GROWING DEMAND ON
- 23 LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL, THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY HAS BECOME
- 24 MORE IMPORTANT THAN EVER IN ORDER TO EFFECTIVELY COMBAT CRIME
- 25 THROUGHOUT L.A. COUNTY. AN ESSENTIAL TOOL IN THE WAR AGAINST



- 1 CRIME IS EXPANDED USE OF VIDEO SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT TO
- 2 IDENTIFY AND PROSECUTE CRIMINALS. SPECIFICALLY, THE SHERIFF'S
- 3 DEPARTMENT IS IMPLEMENTING THE AUTOMATIC SURVEILLANCE AND
- 4 PROTECTION ASAP PROGRAM, WHICH INCLUDES VIDEO SURVEILLANCE,
- 5 GUNSHOT DETECTION AND AUTOMATED VEHICLE LICENSE RECOGNITION
- 6 TECHNOLOGY. WHILE THESE SYSTEMS ARE LARGELY AUTOMATED, THE
- 7 ADDITIONAL AND FULL FUNDING OF ONE ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL
- 8 POSITION AT THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT IS ESSENTIAL IN ORDER TO
- 9 ENSURE THEIR ADEQUATE MAINTENANCE AND CONTINUED EFFECTIVENESS.
- 10 I THEREFORE MOVE TO DIRECT THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER TO
- 11 TRANSFER \$160,000 IN ONGOING FUNDING FROM THE PROVISIONAL
- 12 FINANCE USES ACCOUNT P.F.U. TO THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT TO
- 13 FUND ONE INFORMATIONAL SYSTEMS MANAGER, ONE PERSONNEL POSITION
- 14 FOR PURPOSE OF MAINTAINING THE ASEP PROGRAM. I FURTHER MOVE
- 15 THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE C.A.O. TO WORK IN CONCERT WITH THE
- 16 SHERIFF TO JOINTLY REPORT BACK PRIOR TO SEPTEMBER'S
- 17 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET CHANGES ANY PROGRESS MADE IN FILLING THIS
- 18 POSITION.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IS THERE A SECOND? MR. KNABE
- 21 SECONDS. WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 23 SUP. BURKE: I WILL NOW PASS OUT FAMILY PLACE PROGRAMS
- 24 EXPANSION IN THREE LIBRARIES, 40,000 PER LIBRARY. FAMILY PLACE
- 25 LIBRARIES CREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTING LITERACY AND



- 1 FOSTERING DEVELOPMENTAL SKILLS FOR OUR YOUNGEST POPULATION.
- 2 FAMILY PLACE CENTERS PROVIDE A WELCOME SPACE FOR BABIES,
- 3 TODDLERS AND PARENTS TO ACCESS RESOURCES AND MATERIALS THAT
- 4 EMPHASIZE READING READINESS AND PARENT EDUCATION, AS WELL AS
- 5 DEVELOPMENTALLY APPROPRIATE PROGRAMMING, WITH EXPERTS IN THE
- 6 FIELD OF CHILD HEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT. FAMILY PLACE HAS
- 7 SUCCESSFULLY DEMONSTRATED THAT GOOD HEALTH, EARLY LEARNING,
- 8 PARENT INVOLVEMENT AND SUPPORTIVE COMMUNITIES PLAY A CRITICAL
- 9 ROLE IN YOUNG CHILDREN'S GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT. I THEREFORE
- 10 MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT THE C.A.O. TO
- 11 TRANSFER 120,000 FROM THE PROVISIONAL FINANCING USES P.F.U.
- 12 BUDGET TO THE PUBLIC LIBRARY DEPARTMENT BUDGET FOR EXPANSION
- 13 OF THE FAMILY PLACE PROGRAM AT THE COMPTON, CULVER CITY AND
- 14 LAWNDALE LIBRARIES. I FURTHER MOVE THAT THE BOARD DIRECT THE
- 15 C.A.O. AND LIBRARIAN TO JOINTLY REPORT, PRIOR TO SUPPLEMENTAL
- 16 BUDGET CHANGES IN SEPTEMBER 2007, WITH THE STATUS OF THE
- 17 PROGRESS MADE TOWARDS SUCH EXPANSION.

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECONDED BY MR. ANTONOVICH.

- 20 WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.
- 22 SUP. BURKE: FINALLY, I HAVE ONE OTHER MOTION ON STUDENT
- WORKER.

24

18



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THAT'S GOING TO BE AN AMENDMENT TO
- 2 MINE, I THINK.

3

4 SUP. BURKE: YEAH. OKAY. YOU'RE GOING TO DO THAT, RIGHT?

5

6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YES. I'LL DO IT NEXT.

7

- 8 SUP. BURKE: OKAY. I SUPPORT YOUR MOTION AND YOU WILL INTRODUCE
- 9 THAT SEPARATELY. ON THE SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM, I'D LIKE TO
- 10 AMEND-- I GUESS HAS SUPERVISOR KNABE...

11

12 SUP. KNABE: I'M NOT DONE WITH MY MOTION YET.

- 14 SUP. BURKE: I'LL WAIT UNTIL YOU INTRODUCE THAT AND THEN I'LL
- 15 INTRODUCE THE SUPPLEMENT TO THAT. AND, FINALLY, THE LEGAL
- 16 ADVOCACY COMMUNITY HAS LONG BEEN REQUESTING ADEQUATE
- 17 HEALTHCARE INTERPRETERS AT D.H.S. FACILITIES. THIS APPEARS TO
- 18 BE HEADING TO A SIMILAR COLLISION AS THE CIVIL RIGHTS
- 19 COMPLAINT AND SETTLEMENT UNDER THE OLD WRIGHT PROGRAM. COST IS
- 20 MINIMAL, AT 500,000, GIVEN THE COUNTY'S POTENTIAL LEGAL
- 21 LIABILITY. I THEREFORE MOVE TO INSTRUCT C.A.O. AND D.H.S. TO
- 22 IDENTIFY A POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCE FOR THE FUNDING OF
- 23 EXISTING HEALTHCARE INTERPRETER POSITIONS AT A LEVEL THAT WILL
- 24 ADEQUATELY SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE COUNTY L.A. POPULATION AND
- 25 PRESENT A RECOMMENDATION OF AN APPROPRIATE FUNDING LEVEL AND



- PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION IN TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF ANY
- 2 2007/2008 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET CHANGES IN SEPTEMBER.

3

4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECONDED BY KNABE.

5

- 6 SUP. BURKE: AND SO I'LL COME BACK AFTER SUPERVISOR KNABE AND
- 7 AFTER YOU HAVE INTRODUCED YOUR MOTIONS. ACTUALLY, I'M GOING TO
- 8 JOIN IN YOUR MOTION.

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YES, THAT'S TRUE. OKAY. UNANIMOUS
- 11 VOTE ON YOUR PREVIOUS MOTION. SECONDED BY MR. KNABE. LET ME
- 12 READ THESE QUICKLY. EARLIER THIS MONTH, STANDARD AND POORS
- 13 RATING SERVICES RAISED ITS RATING ON LOS ANGELES COUNTY LEASE
- 14 DEBT AND PENSION OBLIGATION BONDS TO A-PLUS, A RAISE FROM ITS
- 15 PREVIOUS RATING OF A AND ASSIGNED US A.A. MINUS ISSUE OR
- 16 CREDIT RATING TO THE COUNTY. ACCORDING TO THE STANDARD AND
- 17 POORS REPORT, AND I'LL QUOTE FROM IT, "THE UPGRADE REFLECTS
- 18 THE COUNTY'S IMPROVED LONG-TERM GENERAL CREDIT WORTHINESS. THE
- 19 OUTLOOK IS STABLE, REFLECTING A STRONG ECONOMY, LOW DEBT AND
- 20 GOOD FUND BALANCES, WHICH HAVE SHOWN GRADUAL GROWTH OVER THE
- 21 LAST SEVERAL YEARS." OVER THE PAST DECADE, THE BOARD OF
- 22 SUPERVISORS HAS EXERCISED FISCAL RESTRAINT AND RESPONSIBILITY
- 23 AND THESE IMPROVED RATINGS ARE CLEAR EVIDENCE OF THAT. STILL,
- 24 THERE'S ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT AND ONE OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT
- 25 AREAS OF POTENTIAL LIABILITY IS RETIREE HEALTH. WHILE THE



- 1 COUNTY'S PENSION SYSTEM IS LARGELY FUNDED, THE SAME IS NOT THE
- 2 CASE FOR THE RETIREE MEDICAL, DENTAL, VISION AND LIFE
- 3 INSURANCE, ALSO KNOWN AS OTHER POST EMPLOYEE BENEFITS OR
- 4 O.P.E.B. HISTORICALLY, THE COUNTY HAS PAID FOR BENEFITS
- 5 COVERING EMPLOYEES IN THE LACERA PENSION PLAN ON A PAY AS YOU
- 6 GO BASIS, PAYING FOR BENEFITS ACCRUED IN THE PAST FOR
- 7 EMPLOYEES AS THEY RETIRE. AS A RESULT, ACCORDING TO THE MAY
- 8 2007 ACTUARIAL REPORT CONDUCTED BY MILLIMAN CONSULTANTS AND
- 9 ACTUARIES, LOS ANGELES COUNTY HAS AN ACCRUED LIABILITY IN THE
- 10 RANGE OF \$12.3 BILLION TO \$13 BILLION. WHILE THE BOARD OF
- 11 SUPERVISORS RECENTLY BEGAN TO SET ASIDE A SMALL AMOUNT OF
- 12 FUNDS FOR-- A RELATIVELY SMALL AMOUNT OF FUNDS FOR RETIREE
- 13 HEALTH, THERE IS NO FISCAL POLICY IN PLACE TO PRE-FUND THE
- 14 O.P.E.B. BENEFITS. PREFUNDING INVOLVES PAYING FOR BENEFITS FOR
- 15 CURRENT EMPLOYEES AS THEY ARE EARNED IN ADDITION TO AN ANNUAL
- 16 AMOUNT NECESSARY TO PAY OFF ANY PAST UNFUNDED LIABILITY OVER A
- 17 GIVEN NUMBER OF YEARS. PREFUNDING RETIREE HEALTH WOULD ALLOW
- 18 THE INVESTMENT RETURN ON MONEY SET ASIDE TO PAY FOR A MAJOR
- 19 PORTION OF FUTURE COSTS. FURTHERMORE, CONTINUING TO OPERATE ON
- 20 A PAY AS YOU GO BASIS WOULD ONLY COMPOUND THE PROBLEM, MAKING
- 21 IT MORE DIFFICULT TO ADDRESS IN THE FUTURE, ESPECIALLY GIVEN
- 22 HIGH RATES OF HEALTHCARE INFLATION. EARLY ATTENTION MAY ALLOW
- 23 THE COUNTY TO AVOID SERIOUS FUTURE FINANCIAL PROBLEMS. TO
- 24 BEGIN ADDRESSING THESE FUTURE LIABILITIES, THE BOARD HAS
- 25 ESTABLISHED A COMMITTEE COMPRISED OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE



- 1 OFFICE, TREASURE AND TAX COLLECTOR, AUDITOR-CONTROLLER, THE
- 2 SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION AND THE COALITION OF
- 3 COUNTY UNIONS TO DEVELOP AND MAKE JOINT LABOR MANAGEMENT
- 4 ADVISORY RECOMMENDATIONS TO MITIGATE AND CONTROL FUTURE
- 5 RETIREE HEALTH COSTS. WE THEREFORE MOVE, MR. KNABE IS JOINING
- 6 ME ON THIS, I APOLOGIZE FOR NOT SAYING THAT AT THE OUTSET, WE
- 7 THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS INSTRUCT THE
- 8 CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER TO REVIEW THE COMMITTEE'S
- 9 RECOMMENDATION AND PREPARE AN ANALYSIS AND REPORT TO THE BOARD
- 10 OF SUPERVISORS FOR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION DURING FISCAL YEAR
- 11 2007/2008 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET DISCUSSIONS IN SEPTEMBER OF THIS
- 12 YEAR. SECONDED BY MR. KNABE. IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION OR
- 13 OBJECTION? IF NO OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE. SECONDLY, THIS IS
- 14 A JOINT MOTION BY ME AND SUPERVISOR BURKE AND I'M GOING TO CUT
- 15 OUT THE PREAMBLE IN THE INTEREST OF TIME AND READ THE RESOLVE
- 16 PART. WE THEREFORE MOVE-- THIS DEALS WITH THE RISE IN
- 17 METHAMPHETAMINE USE AMONG DRUG USERS IN THE COUNTY OF LOS
- 18 ANGELES. WE THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
- 19 INSTRUCT THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND THE DEPARTMENT
- 20 OF PUBLIC HEALTH TO IDENTIFY POTENTIAL FUND-- A POTENTIAL
- 21 FUNDING SOURCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF A METH PREVENTION
- 22 INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR THE TARGET POPULATIONS
- 23 AS OUTLINED IN THE APRIL 10TH, 2007 REPORT THAT WAS DONE BY
- 24 THE DEPARTMENT OF-- I BELIEVE THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH.
- 25 THE PROPOSED PROGRAM SHOULD CONSIDER HIGH-RISK POPULATIONS,



- 1 SUCH AS YOUNG ADULT FEMALES, AND EXPLORE EARLY INTERVENTION
- 2 AND PREVENTION STRATEGIES THAT INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO
- 3 SCHOOL-BASED OUTREACH INTERVENTION. THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD ALSO
- 4 CONSIDER THE ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL OUTREACH FUNDS FOR
- 5 DIFFICULT TO REACH OR UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS, INCLUDING YOUNG
- 6 ADULTS. THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD PRESENT THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS
- 7 FOR A PROPOSED PROGRAM AND APPROPRIATE FUNDING LEVEL IN TIME
- 8 FOR CONSIDERATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2007/2008 SUPPLEMENTAL
- 9 BUDGET IN SEPTEMBER. SECONDED BY MS. BURKE. WITHOUT OBJECTION,
- 10 UNANIMOUS VOTE. ON NOVEMBER 3RD, 2004, THE BOARD OF
- 11 SUPERVISORS ESTABLISHED THE EDUCATION COORDINATING COUNCIL TO
- 12 IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES FOR YOUTH IN THE FOSTER CARE AND
- 13 JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS, ALLOCATING FUNDS TO ASSIST THE
- 14 E.C.C. IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF A BLUEPRINT PLAN. BY FEBRUARY
- 15 2006, THE E.C.C. COMPLETED AND THE BOARD APPROVED THE LANDMARK
- 16 PLAN, EXPECTING MORE, A BLUEPRINT FOR RAISING THE EDUCATIONAL
- 17 ACHIEVEMENT OF FOSTER AND PROBATION YOUTH. OVER THE PAST YEAR,
- 18 THE E.C.C. HAS MADE SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS TO ACHIEVE THE
- 19 BLUEPRINT'S 12 RECOMMENDATIONS. AS A RESULT, IN JUNE OF 2006,
- 20 THE BOARD ALLOCATED AN ADDITIONAL \$185,000 FOR THREE EARLY
- 21 CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS TO
- 22 CONTINUE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN. AT THAT TIME, E.C.C.
- 23 ALSO MADE A COMMITMENT TO SEEK OUTSIDE FUNDING SOURCES. SINCE
- 24 THEN, THE E.C.C. HAS MADE GOOD ON THEIR PROMISE, APPLYING FOR
- 25 A 450,000-DOLLAR GRANT FROM THE KEK FOUNDATION AND A \$200,000



- 1 GRANT FROM THE WEINGART FOUNDATION. BOTH FOUNDATIONS ARE
- 2 REQUESTING A SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC SECTOR INVESTMENT AND, TO
- 3 DATE, THE CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES AND PROBATION
- 4 DEPARTMENT HAVE EACH AGREED TO ALLOCATE \$50,000 TOWARD THIS
- 5 IMPORTANT EFFORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007/2008. TO DEMONSTRATE OUR
- 6 CONTINUED COMMITMENT TO THIS PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP, THE
- 7 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SHOULD CONSIDER PROVIDING A FINAL
- 8 ALLOCATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$100,000 TO HELP SECURE THESE TWO
- 9 GRANTS. IF AWARDED, THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE GRANTS TOGETHER
- 10 WOULD FULLY FUND E.C.C.'S REMAINING EFFORTS TO COMPLETE
- 11 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BLUEPRINT PLAN OVER THE NEXT TWO YEARS.
- 12 I THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DIRECT THE
- 13 C.A.O. TO IDENTIFY OPTIONS FOR PROVIDING THE \$100,000 NEEDED
- 14 TO LEVERAGE PRIVATE FUNDING SOURCES NECESSARY FOR E.C.C. TO
- 15 COMPLETE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BLUEPRINT PLAN AND REPORT BACK
- 16 ON THE FUNDING OPTIONS IN TIME FOR CONSIDERATION DURING THE
- 17 2007/2008 FISCAL YEAR SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET IN SEPTEMBER.
- 18 SECONDED BY MR. ANTONOVICH. WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.
- 19 THE LAST MOTION I HAVE IS ON DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PROGRAM AND
- 20 ENERGY SAVINGS. ON JANUARY 16TH, 2007, THE BOARD OF
- 21 SUPERVISORS APPROVED A COUNTYWIDE ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL
- 22 POLICY ESTABLISHING, AMONG OTHER THINGS, THE GOAL OF REDUCING
- 23 ENERGY CONSUMPTION IN COUNTY BUILDINGS BY 20% BY 2015. TO MEET
- 24 THIS GOAL, THE INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT ADMINISTERS
- 25 PROGRAMS TO DESERVE ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS BY OPTIMIZING



- 1 BUILDING SYSTEMS AND IMPLEMENTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROJECTS.
- 2 I.S.D. IS ALSO RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING ROUTINE BUILDING
- 3 MAINTENANCE FOR MANY OF THE COUNTY'S BUILDINGS AND FOR
- 4 DEVELOPING A DEFERRED MAINTENANCE LIST OF THE BUILDING
- 5 MAINTENANCE, REPAIR AND SYSTEM UPGRADE PROJECTS THAT ARE
- 6 POSTPONED OR DEFERRED UNTIL FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE. FOR
- 7 THESE BUILDINGS, A DEFERRED MAINTENANCE LISTING OF REPAIR
- 8 PROJECTS IS PREPARED ANNUALLY. CURRENTLY, THE LIST INCLUDES
- 9 PROJECTS VALUED AT MORE THAN \$180 MILLION. IN 2001, I.S.D.
- 10 DEVELOPED A METHODOLOGY FOR PRIORITIZING THE LIST OF DEFERRED
- 11 MAINTENANCE PROJECTS CALL THE DEFERRED MAINTENANCE PRIORITIZER
- 12 OR THE D.M.P. I GUESS THAT COULD ALSO BE CALLED DUMP. THE
- 13 D.M.P. PROVIDES THE DEPARTMENT WITH AN OBJECTIVE AND
- 14 CONSISTENT APPROACH TO ADDRESSING THE COUNTY BACKLOG OF
- 15 MAINTENANCE PROJECTS. THE D.M.P. TAKES INTO CONSIDERATION
- 16 CRITERIA SUCH AS LIFE EXPECTANCY OF THE EQUIPMENT, PREDICTED
- 17 TIME FOR EQUIPMENT FAILURE, EFFECTIVE EQUIPMENT FAILURE, TIME
- 18 REQUIRED TO REPAIR EQUIPMENT. A FACTOR THAT IS CURRENTLY NOT
- 19 CONSIDERED WHEN PRIORITIZING THE DEFERRED MAINTENANCE LIST IS
- 20 THE REDUCTION OF ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND THE SAVINGS GENERATE
- 21 AS A RESULT OF THE REPAIR OR SYSTEM UPGRADE. INCLUDING SUCH
- 22 CRITERIA WILL SUPPORT THE BOARD'S RECENTLY APPROVED COUNTYWIDE
- 23 ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY IN OUR GOAL OF REDUCING ENERGY
- 24 CONSUMPTION. WE THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE INTERNAL SERVICES
- 25 DEPARTMENT INCORPORATE AN ENERGY CONSUMPTION AND SAVINGS



- 1 FACTOR INTO THE CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZING THE DEFERRED
- 2 MAINTENANCE LIST AND WE FURTHER MOVE THAT THE CRITERIA BE
- 3 CONSISTENT WITH THOSE ESTABLISHED BY THE LEADERSHIP IN ENERGY
- 4 AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS L.E.E.D. PROGRAM,
- 5 FOR OBTAINING L.E.E.D. CERTIFICATION FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS.
- 6 THIS IS JOINTLY PRESENTED BY MR. ANTONOVICH AND MYSELF.
- 7 WITHOUT OBJECTION, SO ORDERED. THOSE ARE ALL THE MOTIONS I
- 8 HAVE. MS. MOLINA?

- 10 SUP. MOLINA: I HAVE ONE MOTION WITH REGARD TO CAPITAL PROJECTS
- 11 AND DEFERRED-- AND THE MAINTENANCE. THERE ARE CURRENTLY 5,147
- 12 COUNTY OWNED FACILITIES IN WHICH THE COUNTY PAID OVER 4.7
- 13 BILLION TO ACQUIRE, CONSTRUCT. THE COUNTY HAS SET ASIDE
- 14 FUNDING IN THE BUDGET FOR 406 ADDITIONAL CAPITAL PROJECTS THAT
- 15 ARE VALUED AT 3.6 BILLION. WHILE THE COUNTY CONTINUES TO BUILD
- 16 NEW FACILITIES, THERE DOES NOT APPEAR TO BE ANY FUNDING PLAN
- 17 FOR THE LONG-TERM MAINTENANCE NEEDS OF THE FACILITIES THAT ARE
- 18 BEING CONSTRUCTED. THE CURRENT SYSTEM OF BUILDING MAINTENANCE
- 19 IS ONE OF PROPRIETORSHIP. INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENTS ARE
- 20 RESPONSIBLE FOR MAINTAINING AND OPERATING THE BUILDINGS THAT
- 21 THEY OCCUPY. WHILE THIS MAY WORK FOR SOME OF THE DEPARTMENTS,
- 22 IT DOESN'T WORK FOR SOME OF THE OTHERS. AS AN EXAMPLE, THE
- 23 INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT MAINTAINS A NUMBER OF COUNTY
- 24 FACILITIES, APPROXIMATELY 600, FOR WHICH THE DEFERRED
- 25 MAINTENANCE IS ESTIMATED AT AROUND 200 MILLION. THIS ONLY



- 1 REPRESENTS A FRACTION OF THE FACILITIES THAT THE COUNTY OWNS
- 2 AND IT IS UNCLEAR WHAT THE MAINTENANCE NEED OF COUNTY
- 3 FACILITIES TRULY IS. I THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF
- 4 SUPERVISORS DIRECT THE C.E.O. TO, NUMBER 1, DEVELOP A LONG
- 5 TERM PLAN FOR FUNDING THE DEFERRED MAINTENANCE LIST BASED ON
- 6 PRIORITY NEED AND REPORT TO THE BOARD IN 60 DAYS. AND, TWO, TO
- 7 EVALUATE THE CURRENT SYSTEM OF BUILDING MAINTENANCE AND REPORT
- 8 BACK TO THE BOARD WITH RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO IMPROVE THE
- 9 SYSTEM. AND, FINALLY, TO PROVIDE AN ANNUAL STATUS REPORT
- 10 CONCURRENT WITH THE PROPOSED BUDGET OF ALL MAJOR CAPITAL
- 11 PROJECTS CURRENTLY FUNDED BY THE BOARD, INCLUDING THE ORIGINAL
- 12 BUDGET, WHEN THE PROJECT WAS AUTHORIZED, THE CURRENT BUDGET,
- 13 THE SOURCE OF THE FUNDS, THE COMPLETION DATE AND OTHER
- 14 RELEVANT CRITERIA TO EFFECTIVELY TRACK EACH PROJECT.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECONDED BY MRS. BURKE. ANY
- 17 DISCUSSION? HEARING NO DISCUSSION, WITHOUT OBJECTION,
- 18 UNANIMOUS VOTE. MR. KNABE?

- 20 SUP. KNABE: YES, MR. CHAIRMAN, THANK YOU. SEVERAL MOTIONS.
- 21 FIRST IS A JOINT MOTION BY MYSELF AND YOU IN REGARDS TO THE
- 22 YOUTH JOBS PROGRAM. I UNDERSTAND THAT SUPERVISOR BURKE IS
- 23 GOING TO AMEND THAT, AS WELL. BUT, AS WAS MENTIONED EARLIER IN
- 24 THE BUDGET REPORT, LAST YEAR, THIS BOARD APPROVED THE ONE-TIME
- 25 USE OF NET COUNTY COSTS IN THE AMOUNT OF 6.5 MILLION TO FUND



- 1 THE YOUTH JOBS PROGRAM. ORIGINALLY, THIS WAS FUND BY THE
- 2 FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT AND THE SUMMER YOUTH
- 3 EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM HAS BEEN FUNDED BY CALWORKS
- 4 PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE FUNDS UP UNTIL THE FUNDING SOURCE ENDED.
- 5 THIS SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR THE YOUTH CONTINUES TO BE A
- 6 CHALLENGE IN THIS COUNTY AND IT GOES ON IN A NUMBER OF
- 7 DIFFERENT WAYS BUT WE THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF
- 8 SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF
- 9 \$6,500,000 TO PREVIOUSLY FUNDED AND CONTRACTED JOBS SERVICE
- 10 PROVIDERS. WE FURTHER MOVE THAT THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY AND
- 11 SENIOR SERVICES OR DESIGNEE BE GIVEN THE DELEGATED AUTHORITY
- 12 TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS WITH APPROPRIATE YOUTH JOB PROVIDERS,
- 13 INCLUDING SEVEN WORKFORCE INVESTMENT BOARDS, TO SUSTAIN THE
- 14 YOUTH JOBS PROGRAM DURING THE SUMMER OF 2007 AFTER THE C.A.O.
- 15 AND COUNTY COUNCIL APPROVE THE CONTRACT FORM. AND I WOULD MOVE
- 16 THAT.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SECONDED BY MYSELF,
- 19 WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

20

21 SUP. KNABE: I ALSO-- COME BACK?

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: DID YOU WANT TO AMEND THAT? BEFORE
- 24 WE VOTE ON IT, THEN, LET'S AMEND-- MS. BURKE.



- 1 SUP. BURKE: LAST YEAR, NEARLY 800,000 OF THE 6.5 MILLION WHICH
- 2 THE BOARD ALLOCATED FOR SUMMER YOUTH JOBS WENT UNSPENT. THIS
- 3 YEAR, WE'RE AGAIN BACKFILLING A HISTORICALLY FEDERAL PROGRAM
- 4 AND WE ARE RISKING THAT SOME OF THESE FUNDS WILL NOT REACH THE
- 5 INTENDED YOUTH BECAUSE MANY SCHOOLS HAVE ALREADY RECESSED FOR
- 6 SUMMER VACATION. I THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF
- 7 SUPERVISORS DIRECT THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER AND
- 8 DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICES TO
- 9 MAKE THE FULL ALLOCATION OF THE 6.5 MILLION FOR THE SUMMER
- 10 YOUTH JOBS PROGRAM AVAILABLE TO ALL ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS
- 11 THROUGH JUNE 30TH, 2008.

12

- 13 SUP. KNABE: YOU'RE AMENDING THE MOTION TO DO THAT? I'D MOVE IT
- 14 AS AMENDED.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECONDED BY MR. KNABE. THE
- 17 AMENDMENT-- WITHOUT OBJECTION, THE AMENDMENT IS APPROVED. NOW
- 18 WE HAVE THE ITEM AS AMENDED. KNABE MOVES, I'LL SECOND, WITHOUT
- 19 OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 21 SUP. KNABE: THANK YOU. ALSO, THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF
- 22 GOVERNMENTS, THE COG, IS COMPOSED OF 27 MEMBER CITIES ACROSS
- 23 THE SOUTHEAST LOS ANGELES COUNTY, SPANNING THREE SUPERVISORIAL
- 24 DISTRICTS, ENCOMPASSING A COMBINED POPULATION OF OVER 2
- 25 MILLION. THE GATEWAY COG HAS TAKEN UP THE COMPLEX ISSUE OF

23



- 1 HOMELESSNESS AND CONDUCTED A THOROUGH REVIEW OF THE ISSUES AND
- 2 HOW IT IMPACTS THEIR CITIES IN THE SOUTHWEST REGION OF THE
- 3 COUNTY. I BELIEVE THAT AN ASPECT OF ANY SOLUTION TO THIS
- 4 PROGRAM WILL REQUIRE NOTHING LESS THAN THE FULL SUPPORT OF THE
- 5 CITIES AND COMMUNITIES ACROSS THE COUNTY. WE HAVE THIS
- 6 SIGNIFICANT BODY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE COME TOGETHER AND
- 7 COME FORWARD TO WORK IN PARTNERSHIP WITH US. SO THE GATEWAY
- 8 COG IS COMMITTED TO DEVELOPING A COMPREHENSIVE REGIONAL PLAN
- 9 TO ADDRESS HOMELESSNESS ISSUES IN THEIR REGION. THEY INDICATED
- 10 THEIR COMMITMENT TO THIS ISSUE IN A LETTER TO THE BOARD OF
- 11 SUPERVISORS DATED AUGUST 2ND OF 2006 AND THE C.A.O. RESPONDED
- 12 TO THEM ON APRIL 2ND OF 2007, INFORMING THEM OF HIS INTENT TO
- 13 RECOMMEND THAT 1.2 MILLION IN ANNUAL FUNDING BE AVAILABLE TO
- 14 THE GATEWAY COG. SO I WOULD MOVE THAT THIS BOARD INSTRUCT THE
- 15 C.A.O. TO MOVE 1.2 MILLION FROM THE CENTRAL HOMELESS
- 16 PREVENTION FUND TO A P.F.U. ACCOUNT FOR THE GATEWAY COG AS
- 17 FOLLOWS, AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$150,000 WILL BE SET ASIDE ON
- 18 A ONE TIME BASIS TO RETAIN A CONSULTANT TO WORK WITH THE
- 19 GATEWAY COG FOR THEIR HOMELESS SERVICES STRATEGY. AND, UPON
- 20 SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF THE STRATEGY, AN AMOUNT NOT TO
- 21 EXCEED 1.2 MILLION PER YEAR TO FUND THE CAPITAL AND SERVICE
- 22 ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED WITHIN THAT STRATEGY. THAT'S MY MOTION.
- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IS THERE A SECOND TO THIS? MS.
- 25 MOLINA SECONDS? AND THIS IS FUNDED OUT OF THE-- INCLUDING THE



- 1 ONGOING? THE SECOND PART. UPON SUBMISSION AND SUBMISSION OF
- 2 THE STRATEGY, AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED 1.2 MILLION PER YEAR?

3

4 SUP. KNABE: THIS IS THE HOMELESS STABILIZATION.

5

- 6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT'S A STABILIZATION FUND. SO, YES, IT IS
- 7 IDENTIFIED AS ONGOING.

8

- 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO IT'S COMING OUT OF THE ONGOING
- 10 PORTION OF THE FUND?

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OF THE STABILIZATION. REMEMBER, WE PROPOSED
- 13 FIVE CENTERS.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I DO REMEMBER.

16

- 17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIS WOULD BE ONE OF THEM AND THEY ARE TO BE
- 18 COMMENDED FOR WHAT THEY'RE DOING HERE, STEPPING UP TO THE
- 19 PLATE.

20

21 **SUP. KNABE:** ABSOLUTELY.

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I TOTALLY, TOTALLY AGREE. I JUST
- 24 WANTED TO MAKE SURE I KNEW WHERE IT WAS COMING. OKAY. ANY
- 25 FURTHER DISCUSSION? WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.



1

- 2 SUP. KNABE: THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
- 3 DEPARTMENT GOES TO GREAT LENGTHS TO PURSUE COLLECTION OF CHILD
- 4 SUPPORT PAYMENTS ON BEHALF OF FAMILIES IN NEED. THERE ARE
- 5 APPROXIMATELY 2,000 PARENTS WHO FALL UNDER THIS CATEGORY AND
- 6 THEY OWE SOME \$2.5 MILLION IN CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS. FAR TOO
- 7 MANY FAMILIES ARE STRUGGLING TO PAY THEIR BILLS BECAUSE THESE
- 8 INDIVIDUALS CHOOSE TO EVADE OR IGNORE THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES.
- 9 ON APRIL 4TH, ON MY MOTION, THE BOARD ORDERED C.S.S.D. TO
- 10 INITIATE A PARTNERSHIP WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO DEVELOP A
- 11 PLAN TO INCREASE ENFORCEMENT AGAINST PARENTS WHO ARE THE MOST
- 12 DELINOUENT IN THEIR CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS. SO I THEREFORE
- 13 MOVE THAT THE C.E.O. REPORT BACK, DURING THE SEPTEMBER
- 14 SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET, WITH A PLAN TO FUND \$500,000 FOR THE
- 15 CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES DEPARTMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF FUNDING A
- 16 COLLABORATIVE EFFORT WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY TO INCREASE
- 17 ENFORCEMENT AGAINST PARENTS WHO ARE THE MOST DELINQUENT IN
- 18 THEIR CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECONDED BY MS. MOLINA. WITHOUT
- 21 OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 23 SUP. KNABE: MY FINAL MOTION. ON ANY GIVEN NIGHT, AS WE KNOW,
- 24 THERE ARE A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF VETERANS WHO ARE LIVING ON
- 25 THE STREETS. THE 2005 HOMELESS COUNT IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY



- 1 ESTIMATED THE NUMBER TO BE OVER 15,000 AND THERE IS EVERY
- 2 INDICATION THAT NUMBER IS LIKELY TO GROW MUCH HIGHER IN 2007.
- 3 LACK OF ACCESS TO SERVICES AND HOUSING, SERIOUS MENTAL HEALTH
- 4 ISSUES, POOR STRATEGIC PLANNING AND A NUMBER OF OTHER
- 5 BUREAUCRATIC RED TAPE STAND IN THE WAY BETWEEN THESE HONORABLE
- 6 MEN AND WOMEN AND THEIR HEALTH AND WELLBEING. WE ALL KNOW TOO
- 7 WELL THE DOCUMENTED FAILURES OF THE SERVICE SYSTEM SET IN
- 8 PLACE TO ASSIST VETERANS. WHILE IT IS MY BELIEF THAT IT IS
- 9 ULTIMATELY THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO
- 10 ADDRESS THOSE PROBLEMS, WE CANNOT STAND BY AND WAIT FOR
- 11 SOLUTIONS TO EMERGE FROM WASHINGTON. I BELIEVE THAT THE
- 12 IMPETUS TO TAKE ACTION THEN SHOULD COME FROM THE LOCAL LEVEL.
- 13 OUR BOARD HAS MADE A FINANCIAL COMMITMENT TO ADDRESS THE
- 14 HOMELESS PROBLEM HERE IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE NEED TO
- 15 BETTER SERVE HOMELESS VETERANS THAT HAS BEEN RAISED FROM TIME
- 16 AND TIME AGAIN. THE CITY OF LONG BEACH HAS A VERY HIGHLY
- 17 EFFECTIVE CONTINUUM OF CARE IN PLACE TO ADDRESS THE HOMELESS
- 18 PROBLEM AND IT IS BELIEVED THAT UP TO 14 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL
- 19 NUMBER OF HOMELESS VETERANS IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY CAN BE FOUND
- 20 IN THE LONG BEACH AREA. INSTITUTING A PROGRAM SPECIFICALLY
- 21 DESIGNED FOR THESE HOMELESS VETERANS AND THEIR SPECIAL NEEDS
- 22 WILL BE AN EFFECTIVE MEANS NOT ONLY TO ADDRESS THEIR SERIOUS
- 23 HOMELESS PROBLEM BUT ALSO TO HONOR THESE MEN AND WOMEN FOR
- 24 THEIR MILITARY SERVICE BY MAKING SURE THEY DON'T FALL THROUGH
- 25 THE CRACKS. SO I WOULD MOVE THAT THE C.E.O. WORK IN



- 1 COORDINATION WITH THE CITY OF LONG BEACH TO DEVELOP A
- 2 COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PACKAGE TO IMPROVE AND ENHANCE
- 3 SPECIALIZED SERVICES FOR HOMELESS VETERANS IN THE LONG BEACH
- 4 AREA AND REPORT BACK WITH A PLAN IN 90 DAYS. I FURTHER MOVE
- 5 THAT THE C.E.O. MOVE \$500,000 FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT
- 6 ALLOCATION OF ONGOING STABILIZATION CENTER FUNDS FROM THE
- 7 HOMELESS PREVENTION FUND TO A P.F.U. FOR HOMELESS VETERANS TO
- 8 SUPPORT THE SERVICE ENHANCEMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THE PLAN.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECONDED BY MS. MOLINA, WITHOUT
- 11 OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

12

13 SUP. KNABE: THAT'S ALL I HAVE.

14

15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MS. BURKE?

16

- 17 SUP. BURKE: YES. BUT, FIRST, I'D LIKE TO CLARIFY THE
- 18 REPLACEMENT, THE MEALS, THE CONGREGATE MEALS AND ALSO THE HOME
- 19 DELIVERED MEALS. I WANT TO SAY AGAIN THAT I'D LIKE TO HOLD MY
- 20 MOTION UNTIL WE GET A CHANCE FOR THE C.A.O. TO TAKE CARE OF
- 21 THIS ISSUE. SO I'LL HOLD THIS IN ABEYANCE TO GIVE AN
- 22 OPPORTUNITY FOR THIS TO BE RESOLVED.

23

24 SUP. ANTONOVICH: MOVE FOR RECONSIDERATION.



1 SUP. BURKE: I'LL MOVE THAT...

2

- 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SECOND BY-- MS. BURKE MOVES FOR
- 4 RECONSIDERATION. MR. ANTONOVICH SECONDS. WITHOUT OBJECTION,
- 5 THE MATTER IS RECONSIDERED AND IT'S REFERRED BACK TO MS.
- 6 BURKE'S OFFICE.

- 8 SUP. BURKE: ALL RIGHT. THEN I WOULD LIKE TO RAISE THE ISSUE OF
- 9 THE WORKER SHORTAGE, AND PARTICULARLY AS FAR AS STUDENT
- 10 WORKERS. A STUDENT WORKER PROGRAM HAS BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL IN
- 11 THE COUNTY OVER THE YEARS AND WE HAVE TO TRY TO DEVELOP MORE
- 12 WORKERS WHO COME THROUGH AND CAREER COUNTY EMPLOYEES. AND
- 13 WE'VE BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL WITH DEPARTMENT-SPECIFIC FUNDS,
- 14 SUCH AS THE CAREER DEVELOPMENT INTERN PROGRAM, WHICH PLACES
- 15 CHILDREN WHO HAVE MATRICULATED THROUGH THE FOSTER CARE INTO
- 16 COUNTY POSITIONS AND PROVIDES RESOURCES AND SUPPORT. I PROPOSE
- 17 DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED COUNTYWIDE SYSTEM FOR MANAGING
- 18 THIS WORKFORCE. I THEREFORE MOVE THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
- 19 DIRECT THE C.A.O. TO TRANSFER 150,000 IN ONGOING FUNDING FROM
- 20 THE PROVISIONAL FINANCE USES P.F.U. BUDGET TO THE DEPARTMENT
- 21 OF HUMAN RESOURCES, D.H.R. BUDGET, TO FULLY FUND A NEW STUDENT
- 22 WORKER COORDINATOR PERSONNEL POSITION AND ANY ESSENTIAL
- 23 SUPPORT STAFF ANCILLARY EXPENSES. I FURTHER MOVE THIS BOARD
- 24 DIRECT THE C.A.O. AND DIRECTOR OF D.H.R. TO REPORT BACK PRIOR
- 25 TO SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET CHANGES IN SEPTEMBER 2007 WITH THE



- 1 STATUS OF THEIR PROGRESS IN CREATING AND IMPLEMENTING SUCH A
- 2 POSITION.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SECONDED BY MR.
- 5 ANTONOVICH. WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE. MS. MOLINA?

6

- 7 SUP. MOLINA: I HAVE SOME QUESTIONS WITH REGARD-- AND I THINK
- 8 THIS IS THE RIGHT TIME ON THE CHILDREN SERVICES BUDGET.

9

10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I BELIEVE TRISH IS HERE.

11

12 PATRICIA PLOEHN: GOOD MORNING.

13

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: GOOD MORNING. WELL, NO, WE'RE PAST MORNING, I
- 15 GUESS. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE
- 16 APPROVING THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE TITLE 4-E WAIVER AT
- 17 THE JUNE 26TH MEETING, CORRECT?

18

19 PATRICIA PLOEHN: THAT'S CORRECT.

- 21 SUP. MOLINA: AND RIGHT NOW WHAT WE'RE DOING IS WE'RE BUDGETING
- 22 FOR IT. SO IT'S INCLUDED IN THIS ITEM, AS I UNDERSTAND. AND MY
- 23 QUESTION IS, IS I KNOW WE HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE TO SEE IT AND
- 24 IT'S THE IMPLEMENTATION BUT MY QUESTION IS, ARE YOU ALREADY



- 1 ANTICIPATING HOW WE'RE GOING TO BUDGET FOR THIS AND THE
- 2 SAVINGS THAT ARE THERE? AND HOW ARE YOU GOING TO DO THAT?

3

- 4 PATRICIA PLOEHN: YES. THE BUDGET THAT YOU HAVE IN FRONT OF YOU
- 5 TAKES INTO CONSIDERATION THAT WE ARE ASSUMING APPROVAL OF THIS
- 6 WAIVER PLAN. IF IT WASN'T APPROVED, THERE WOULD BE ADDITIONAL
- 7 MONEY NEEDED IN THE BUDGET BUT WE ARE-- THE ONE THAT YOU HAVE
- 8 IN FRONT OF YOU TAKES INTO CONSIDERATION THAT THE WAIVER MONEY
- 9 WILL COVER THE SALARY AND EMPLOYEE BENEFIT INCREASES FOR
- 10 STAFF, AS WELL AS FOR THE SISTER AGENCIES THAT HAVE CONTRACTS
- 11 WITH OUR DEPARTMENT.

12

13 SUP. MOLINA: BUT IT ALSO HAS SAVINGS THAT ARE IDENTIFIED.

14

- 15 PATRICIA PLOEHN: UNDER THE WAIVER, THAT'S CORRECT. THERE IS
- 16 UNDER THE-- WITH THE NEW FORMULA THAT WE HAVE, WE ARE LOOKING
- 17 AT APPROXIMATELY \$4.2 MILLION OF SAVINGS ANNUALLY OVER THE
- 18 NEXT FIVE YEARS.

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: WHAT IF WE DON'T REALIZE THOSE SAVINGS?

- 22 PATRICIA PLOEHN: THEN WHAT WE WOULD DO IS WE WOULD HAVE TO
- 23 EITHER NOT IMPLEMENT THE STRATEGIES THAT WE ARE PLANNING TO
- 24 IMPLEMENT USING THOSE WAIVER SAVINGS AND/OR WE WOULD HAVE TO
- 25 CUT BACK ON THOSE THAT WE HAD ALREADY IMPLEMENTED.



1

- 2 SUP. MOLINA: I GUESS THAT'S THE ISSUE I HAVE IS THAT WE'RE
- 3 BUDGETING FOR SOMETHING AND WE REALLY DON'T KNOW THAT WE'RE
- 4 GOING TO BE ABLE TO ACHIEVE IT AND THE ONLY OUTCOME IS GOING
- 5 TO BE THAT WE'RE GOING TO CUT BACK ON SERVICES. I HOPE THAT'S
- 6 NOT WHERE WE'RE GOING. THAT, IF WE NEED TO SUPPLEMENT IT, THAT
- 7 WE'RE PREPARED TO DO SO. HOW DO WE HANDLE THAT?

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I MEAN-- IF I UNDERSTOOD THE QUESTION
- 10 CORRECTLY, SUPERVISOR, IS WHAT HAPPENS IF THE WAIVER SAVINGS
- 11 DO NOT OCCUR? NUMBER ONE. AND THAT IS A POSSIBILITY AS WE ARE
- 12 SEEING IN SACRAMENTO RIGHT NOW WITH THE BUDGET CONFERENCE
- 13 COMMITTEE EATING-- ERODING THE ANTICIPATED SAVINGS BY ACTIONS
- 14 THAT THEY'RE TAKING. TWO THINGS. ONE, THE COUNTY DOES HAVE THE
- 15 ABILITY TO OPT OUT OF THE WAIVER WITH A 45 DAY NOTICE. AND,
- 16 SECONDLY, THE COUNTY COULD AUGMENT OR COVER THE LOSS OF THE
- 17 NEW PROGRAMS. AND WHAT I ASKED TRISH IS, WHAT WOULD THE
- 18 GENERAL FUND HAVE TO BE PAYING IF WE WEREN'T DOING THE WAIVER?
- 19 AND THE ANSWER IS SOMETHING OVER \$6 MILLION. SO I THINK THE
- 20 COUNTY SHOULD BE PREPARED, AT SOME POINT, TO STEP UP TO THE
- 21 PLATE IF THE PROGRAMS ARE MAKING A DIFFERENCE. THE WHOLE IDEA
- 22 OF THE WAIVER IS OBVIOUSLY TO GIVE US THE FLEXIBILITY TO TRY
- 23 PROGRAMS THAT KEEP PEOPLE OUT OF OUR SYSTEM. IF THAT IS
- 24 WORKING, THEN THAT'S A PRETTY STRONG MOTIVATION TO CONTINUE TO
- 25 FUND THE PROGRAM.



1

- 2 SUP. MOLINA: I'M ALL IN FAVOR OF THE WAIVER. IT'S HOW IT'S
- 3 GOING TO OPERATE. HOW IT'S GOING TO BE IMPLEMENTED. THERE'S A
- 4 A LOT OF WHAT IFS BUT I GUESS THE QUESTION, AND SHE RESPONDED,
- 5 WHAT IF WE DON'T REALIZE THE SAVINGS? THEN WE'LL CUT BACK ON
- 6 SERVICES. I'D RATHER NOT DO THAT. I'D RATHER HAVE A
- 7 PRESENTATION IN WHICH I KNOW WE'RE GOING TO-- AND I HAVEN'T
- 8 REVIEWED THE ENTIRE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN BUT I GUESS I'M MORE
- 9 INTERESTED IN, IF IT'S NOT WORKING, WHY IT'S NOT WORKING BUT I
- 10 DON'T WANT TO CUT BACK ON THE SERVICES AND, IF WE NEED TO DO
- 11 THAT, WE NEED TO FIND A WAY BECAUSE THESE ARE VERY ESSENTIAL
- 12 SERVICES FOR CHILDREN AND I'M JUST-- I'M CONCERNED AS TO HOW
- 13 WE'RE GOING TO HANDLE IT. BUT I HOPE, WITHOUT HAVING TO PUT IN
- 14 A MOTION, BECAUSE IT'S NOT COMING BEFORE US UNTIL THE 26TH,
- 15 THAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE AT LEAST, FROM MY POINT OF VIEW, THE
- 16 DEPARTMENT, IT HAS TO BE PRESENTED TO US INSTEAD OF LOOKING AT
- 17 CUTTING BACK SERVICES BECAUSE THIS DOES PROVIDE INCREASES,
- 18 PARTICULARLY TO GROUP AND FOSTER CARE HOMES, AS WELL, AND
- 19 SAVINGS. AND SO THOSE ARE ALL, AGAIN, WITH THE IDEA THAT WE'RE
- 20 GETTING THE KIND OF FLEXIBILITY THAT WE NEED IN ORDER TO
- 21 PROVIDE A MORE COORDINATED APPROACH TO PROVIDING THESE
- 22 SERVICES, CORRECT?

23

24 PATRICIA PLOEHN: THAT'S CORRECT.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: ALL RIGHT. AND I DO KNOW THAT I HAD ASKED
- 2 QUESTIONS AND WAS VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE ASSESSMENTS THE
- 3 LAST TIME AROUND AND IT'S JUST GREAT THAT WE'VE MADE A HELL OF
- 4 A LOT OF PROGRESS FROM THE STANDPOINT THAT YOU WERE MUCH
- 5 FURTHER AHEAD IN CATCHING UP, ALTHOUGH NOT COMPLETELY BUT
- 6 THAT'S A VERY SHORT PERIOD OF TIME. YOU'VE DONE A VERY GOOD
- 7 JOB.

8

9 PATRICIA PLOEHN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

10

- 11 SUP. MOLINA: AND THEN, FINALLY, ON THE PART I WAS CRITICAL NOT
- 12 OF THE DEPARTMENT BUT ALSO OF DAVID JANSSEN IS THAT I ALWAYS
- 13 USED TO ASK, BECAUSE HE WAS VERY PROUD OF PRESENTING, I THINK
- 14 IT WAS ALMOST THREE YEARS AGO, THE DEPARTMENT PROGRAM SUMMARY
- 15 AND PERFORMANCE. IT WAS ALWAYS BLANK OR NOT APPLICABLE AND NOW
- 16 THEY'RE FILLED IN. NOW THE NEXT PART IS I DON'T UNDERSTAND
- 17 THEM BUT I'M GOING TO WORK ON THAT END OF IT BECAUSE THAT'S MY
- 18 RESPONSIBILITY. [LAUGHTER]

19

20 SUP. MOLINA: BUT I'M GLAD THAT THEY'RE THERE. THANK YOU.

21

22 PATRICIA PLOEHN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

- 24 SUP. KNABE: IF I COULD JUST ADD TO THAT, MR. CHAIRMAN. I MEAN,
- 25 OBVIOUSLY, I REMAIN CONCERNED, AS WELL, TOO. THE SAVINGS



- 1 STARTED OUT, IT WAS 72 MILLION, THEN IT'S 60, AND NOW IT'S 20
- 2 AND THEN MAYBE THIS AND SO I ASSUME, IF WE STAY ON THE WAIVER,
- 3 THE ONLY WAY TO HANDLE THIS WOULD BE THROUGH NET COUNTY COSTS,
- 4 IS THAT CORRECT?

5

6 PATRICIA PLOEHN: THAT'D BE CORRECT.

7

- 8 SUP. KNABE: THANK YOU. NO, I MEAN-- ARE THERE ANY OTHER
- 9 POTENTIAL LOANING COSTS THAT REFLECT NET COUNTY COSTS FOR
- 10 FOSTER CARE THAT WE NEED TO BE AWARE OF?

11

- 12 PATRICIA PLOEHN: NONE THAT WE'RE AWARE OF. THE 5 PERCENT
- 13 INCREASE FOR GROUP HOMES IN FOSTER CARE IS CONTINGENT UPON THE
- 14 GOVERNOR'S SIGNATURE, WHICH WILL PROBABLY OCCUR WITHIN THE
- 15 NEXT FEW WEEKS. OTHER THAN THAT, I KNOW OF NOTHING ELSE THAT'S
- 16 LOOMING IN THE HORIZON.

17

18 SUP. KNABE: OKAY. THANK YOU.

19

20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MR. ANTONOVICH?

- 22 SUP. ANTONOVICH: THE 58 PERCENT DECLINE IN THE NUMBER OF
- 23 CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE FROM 58,000 TO 20,000 IS COMMENDABLE
- 24 AND REALLY APPRECIATED BUT THERE WAS A GREATER DROP EARLIER
- 25 THAN THE RECENT TIME. WHAT CONTRIBUTED TO THAT DROP? AND



- 1 SHOULD WE CONTINUE USING SOME OF THOSE ADMINISTRATIVE
- 2 PROCEDURES INSTEAD OF CHANGING?

3

- 4 PATRICIA PLOEHN: ACTUALLY, I THINK THAT THE POTENTIAL HAS
- 5 ALREADY BEEN EXPENDED ON THOSE STRATEGIES THAT WE WERE USING.
- 6 WE DROPPED FROM ABOUT 48,000 CHILDREN IN THE '90S TO 20,000
- 7 NOW. BUT I THINK IT WAS MORE OF A CULTURE CHANGE BY WHICH WE
- 8 STOPPED LOOKING AT THE ONLY OPTION TO PROVIDE SAFETY TO A
- 9 CHILD IS TO REMOVE THEM FROM THEIR HOME AND STARTED TO
- 10 UNDERSTAND THAT CHILDREN NEEDED FAMILIES AND THAT GROWING UP
- 11 IN FOSTER CARE WAS UNACCEPTABLE. SO IT WAS A COMPLETE CULTURAL
- 12 CHANGE. WHAT HAS RESULTED IS THAT THE CHILDREN THAT WERE OF
- 13 LESSER HIGH NEEDS ARE THE ONES THAT ARE NOW BEING SERVED IN
- 14 THEIR OWN HOMES OR OUT OF CARE AND THAT THE CHILDREN NOW THAT
- 15 ARE STILL IN CARE ARE THOSE WITH VERY HIGH NEEDS. AND THAT'S
- 16 WHY WE NEED THESE ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES THAT WE'VE DESIGNED TO
- 17 BE PAID FOR UNDER THE WAIVER TO ADDRESS THOSE CHILDREN WITH
- 18 THOSE DIFFERENT NEEDS AND THAT WILL ALLOW US TO CONTINUE TO
- 19 DECLINE THE POPULATION.

- 21 SUP. ANTONOVICH: RELATIVE TO THE DECISION TO STAY IN OR OPT
- 22 OUT OF THE WAIVER, IT HAS TO BE WAIVED OR CONSIDERED WHAT'S
- 23 BETTER FOR THE CHILD THAN THE EXPENDITURE ISSUE. THE OUESTION
- 24 IS, HOW FAR ALONG IS THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE WAIVER EVALUATION
- 25 COMPONENT, WHICH MEASURES THE FIRST YEAR OF THE WAIVER?



1

- 2 PATRICIA PLOEHN: IT'S QUITE A WELL AWAY. WE HAVE GOT A MEETING
- 3 NEXT WEEK, I THINK IT IS, WITH CASEY FAMILY PROGRAMS AS WELL
- 4 AS THE STATE. BOTH CASEY AND THE STATE HAVE INDEPENDENT
- 5 INDIVIDUALS ALREADY ASSIGNED TO HELP US TRACK THIS WAIVER,
- 6 BOTH EXPENDITURES AS WELL AS OUTCOMES.

7

- 8 SUP. ANTONOVICH: AND ARE THERE ANY OTHER EVENTS WITH
- 9 WIDESPREAD IMPACTS SUCH AS THE K.D.A. SETTLEMENT THAT COULD
- 10 JEOPARDIZE THE FUTURE OF THE WAIVER?

11

- 12 PATRICIA PLOEHN: K.D.A. IS A REALITY AND IT IS COMING AND WE
- 13 DO HAVE-- WE ARE UNDER A SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT WITH THEM. BUT
- 14 THE BOTTOM LINE IS K.D.A. IS HERE WHETHER OR NOT WE ARE IN THE
- 15 WAIVER OR NOT IN THE WAIVER. WE ARE REOUIRED TO FILL 500 RAP
- 16 SLOTS BY NEXT YEAR OR TO INCREASE BY 500 RAP SLOTS AS WELL AS
- 17 DEVELOP 300 INTENSIVE FOSTER CARE SLOTS. THEY ARE COSTLY
- 18 ENDEAVORS AND WE HAD FULLY INTENDED, PRIOR TO THIS LAST HIT TO
- 19 OUR WAIVER SAVINGS, TO USE SOME OF THAT MONEY TO START
- 20 PURCHASING SOME OF THOSE RAP SLOTS. WE'VE HAD TO STEP BACK
- 21 FROM THAT BUT WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF LOOKING AT A NUMBER OF
- 22 POSSIBLE STRATEGIES TO FUND THOSE NEW SLOTS.

- 24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS OF MS. PLOEHN?
- 25 ALL RIGHT, THANK YOU.



1 PATRICIA PLOEHN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 2 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ARE WE STILL ON ITEM 7? 4 5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES. 6 7 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: CAN I JUST-- I DON'T WANT TO 9 RECONSIDER AT THIS POINT BUT I WANT TO GO BACK TO THE HOMELESS MOTION BECAUSE I'M CONFUSED, NOT ABOUT THE PROJECT BUT IT'S 10 11 ABOUT HOW RESOURCES OF FUNDING. THERE ARE, IN THE COG MOTION, SUPERVISOR KNABE'S MOTION ON THE 1.2 MILLION, IT READS, "THAT 12 13 THE BOARD INSTRUCT THE C.A.O. TO MOVE \$1.2 MILLION FROM THE CENTRAL HOMELESS PREVENTION FUND TO PROVISION FUNDING USE 14 ACCOUNT FOR THE GATEWAY COG AS FOLLOWS ... " AND THEN AS FOLLOWS 15 16 SAYS, "AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED 150,000 WILL BE SET ASIDE ON A ONE-TIME BASIS FOR A CONSULTANT." FINE. THEN IT SAYS, "UPON 17 18 SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF THE STRATEGY, AN AMOUNT NOT TO 19 EXCEED 1.2 MILLION PER YEAR TO FUND CAPITAL AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES IDENTIFIED IN THE STRATEGY." (A) IT DOESN'T ADD UP 20 21 TO 1.2 MILLION. AND, (B) HOW DO YOU... 22 23 SUP. KNABE: THE 150,000 IS PART OF THE 1.2.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY, BUT SECONDLY, HOW DO YOU
- 2 APPROPRIATE MONEY EVERY YEAR WHEN WE HAVE A ONE-YEAR BUDGET?
- 3 I'M NOT CLEAR ON THAT. THIRDLY, I WAS UNDER THE IMPRESSION
- 4 THAT-- I WASN'T UNDER THE IMPRESSION, I THINK IT'S UNDERSTOOD
- 5 THAT WE HAD-- WERE TRYING TO SEGMENT THE FUND AS FAR AS THE
- 6 CAPITAL FUND IN ONE IN EACH PART, IN EACH DISTRICT BUT-- AND
- 7 THIS ONE MAYBE COVERED TWO OR THREE DISTRICTS BUT-- TWO? OKAY.
- 8 BUT THIS DOESN'T, UNLIKE THE LONG BEACH MOTION, WHICH DOES
- 9 COME OUT OF THAT, THIS DOESN'T. SO, WHEN I COME BACK TO YOU
- 10 NEXT WEEK WITH MY SANTA MONICA STABILIZATION CENTER-- I DON'T
- 11 UNDERSTAND THIS. IT'S NOT WHAT I THOUGHT WAS HAPPENING.

12

- 13 SUP. KNABE: WELL, THE 7 MILLION THAT'S SET ASIDE FOR
- 14 STABILIZATION IS ONGOING.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: NO, I DON'T THINK IT WAS ONGOING.
- 17 I THINK IT WAS FOR CAPITAL. THE MONEY THAT WAS SET ASIDE FOR
- 18 STABILIZATION, WELL, LARI, YOU...

19

20 SUP. KNABE: I THOUGHT IT WAS ONGOING.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MAYBE THEY'RE-- NO, LET'S CLARIFY
- 23 IT.



- 1 LARI SHEEHAN: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, YOU DID
- 2 ALLOCATE ON A ONGOING BASIS, SUBJECT OBVIOUSLY TO BUDGET
- 3 CONSIDERATIONS, 7.125 FOR FIVE STABILIZATION CENTERS. THAT WAS
- 4 ALLOCATED PER DISTRICT AND IT'S THE WAY WE UNDERSTOOD IT.

5

- 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I'M SORRY, IT WAS ALLOCATED PER
- 7 DISTRICT.

8

- 9 LARI SHEEHAN: WE UNDERSTOOD IT THAT WE WERE RECOMMENDING THAT
- 10 THERE BE ONE PER DISTRICT. SO IT'S 1.425 PER DISTRICT. AND IN
- 11 THIS PARTICULAR...

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: BUT THAT WASN'T FOR ONGOING
- 14 EXPENSES. THAT WAS FOR CAPITAL.

15

- 16 LARI SHEEHAN: NO. IT'S AN ONGOING PROGRAM. IT WAS PART OF THE
- 17 19.4 SOMETHING OF ONGOING DOLLARS.

18

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY.

- 21 LARI SHEEHAN: AND WHAT WE EXPLAINED TO YOU WHEN WE CAME
- 22 FORWARD IN APRIL OF LAST YEAR WAS THAT WE DIDN'T HAVE ANY
- 23 CAPITAL SPECIFICALLY THERE WITHOUT THE FIRST YEAR COULD
- 24 PROBABLY USE FOR CAPITAL AND THEN, AFTER THAT, IT WOULD BE FOR



- 1 ONGOING SUPPORTIVE AND SERVICES IN RUNNING A FACILITY. AND THE
- 2 BUDGET WAS BUILT AROUND MOSTLY RUNNING A FACILITY.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO IS THIS CURRENT PROPOSED BUDGET
- 5 THAT WE ARE VOTING ON TODAY, DOES THAT INCLUDE YET ANOTHER
- 6 ROUND OF 7 PLUS MILLION DOLLARS?

7

8 LARI SHEEHAN: YES, IT DOES.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND HOW MUCH OF THE 7 MILLION IN
- 11 THE FIRST YEAR OF ONGOING FOR THE STABILIZATION CENTERS HAVE
- 12 WE SPENT, LEAVING THIS ONE ASIDE? ZERO, RIGHT?

13

14 LARI SHEEHAN: WE HAVE NOT SPENT-- ZERO IS THE CORRECT ANSWER.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO YOU WILL NOW, ON THE FIRST OF
- 17 JULY, YOU WILL HAVE \$14-1/2 MILLION DOLLARS OR \$15 MILLION IN
- 18 THAT FUND?

19

20 LARI SHEEHAN: WELL, TECHNICALLY...

21

22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IN THAT ACCOUNT?

- 24 LARI SHEEHAN: ...WHAT MR. JANSSEN HAS DONE IS INDICATED THAT
- 25 WE WILL BE ABLE TO REPROGRAM THE 7.125 THAT WAS NOT SPENT IN



- 1 THE LAST FISCAL YEAR. SO WE WILL BE COMING BACK TO YOUR BOARD
- 2 WITH REPROGRAMMING RECOMMENDATIONS BUT TREATING THAT MONEY AS
- 3 ONE-TIME MONEY.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: REPROGRAMMING IT FOR HOMELESS
- 6 RELATED?

7

- 8 LARI SHEEHAN: OTHER AREAS-- OTHER HOMELESS AREAS AS IT'S
- 9 RELATED FOR HOMELESS PROGRAMS.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: BUT NOT NECESSARILY EXCLUSIVE OF
- 12 THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STABILIZATION CENTER, IF THAT SHOULD BE
- 13 AN OPPORTUNITY THAT PRESENTS ITSELF, CORRECT?

14

- 15 LARI SHEEHAN: YES, IT COULD BE OTHER THAN A STABILIZATION
- 16 CENTER, YES.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: NOW, WHAT ABOUT THE ONE-TIME
- 19 MONIES IN THE HOMELESS, OMNIBUS HOMELESS PACKAGE? HOW MUCH WAS
- 20 SET ASIDE ON A ONE- TIME BASIS?

21

22 LARI SHEEHAN: THERE WAS 80 MILLION IN TOTAL THERE.

23

24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: 80 MILLION TOTAL.



- 1 LARI SHEEHAN: ONE-TIME DOLLARS. AND, TO THE EXTENT THAT WE
- 2 HAVE TWO ITEMS COMING, WE HAVE AN ITEM COMING-- TWO ITEMS
- 3 COMING IN NEXT WEEK TO SPEND THE 32 MILLION CITY COMMUNITY AND
- 4 R.F.P. PROCESS AND THE 20 MILLION REVOLVING LOAN FUND AND THEN
- 5 WE HAVE ANOTHER-- VARIOUS OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH HAVE BEEN
- 6 IMPLEMENTED OR IN VARYING DEGREES OF IMPLEMENTATION.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO HOW DID WE EXPECT, SAY, THE
- 9 CITY OF LOS ANGELES WANTED TO DO A STABILIZATION CENTER OR WAS
- 10 OPEN TO HAVING ONE SOMEWHERE IN ITS CITY, HOW-- WERE WE
- 11 EXPECTING THEM TO PAY FOR THE ACQUISITION OR CONSTRUCTION
- 12 COSTS AND WE WOULD PROVIDE ONGOING TO THIS EXTENT THAT WE HAD
- 13 THE MONEY SET ASIDE, ONGOING SERVICES IN THE CENTER?

14

- 15 LARI SHEEHAN: WHAT WE PLAN TO DO IS WE FELT THAT THE FIRST
- 16 YEAR OF COSTS COULD PROBABLY BE USED FOR CAPITAL AND THEN,
- 17 AFTER THE CAPITAL EXPENDITURE WAS COMPLETED, THEN THE DOLLARS
- 18 WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR ONGOING SERVICES.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MM HM. YEAH. YOU'RE NOT GOING TO
- 21 GET, IN SOME PARTS OF THE COUNTY-- I DON'T THINK MOST PARTS OF
- 22 THE COUNTY ANY MORE, YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GET MUCH FOR A
- 23 \$1,400,000 IN THE WAY OF A SITE. SO IT'S ALMOST LIKE A POISON
- 24 PILL.



- 1 LARI SHEEHAN: IF YOU HAD TO START FROM AFRESH, THAT'S CORRECT.
- 2 IT WOULD NOT BE.

3

- 4 SUP. KNABE: BUT A LOT OF THESE-- PARTICULARLY, THAT'S WHY
- 5 WE'RE ENCOURAGING THEM TO COME TOGETHER, I MEAN, IN THIS
- 6 PARTICULAR PIECE HERE THAT I BROUGHT FORWARD, 20 SOME CITIES
- 7 ARE INVOLVED IN IT.

8

- 9 LARI SHEEHAN: AND THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT LEVERAGING AND THEY
- 10 WILL BE BRINGING SOME FUNDING IN.

11

- 12 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I THINK THE MODEL, THE COG IS-
- 13 USED DOWN THERE IS THE WAY IT SHOULD BE DONE. I JUST WANTED TO
- 14 UNDERSTAND HOW OUR END WAS HANDLING THIS. OKAY. YOU'VE
- 15 ANSWERED MOST OF MY QUESTIONS. ALL RIGHT. ANYTHING ELSE?

16

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I THINK THAT'S ALL ON MEMBER SERVICES.

18

19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ON ITEM 7. DO WE NEED A MOTION?

20

21 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YOU TOOK THEM AS YOU WENT ALONG.

22

- 23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WE TOOK THEM AS WE WENT ALONG SO
- 24 THAT WILL BE SUFFICIENT. OKAY.



- 1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY. ITEM 8 IS A ROUTINE, I HOPE, COUNTY-WIDE
- 2 CLASSIFICATION ACTION TO IMPLEMENT THE FISCAL YEAR PROPOSED
- 3 BUDGET. I RECOMMEND THAT YOU APPROVE IT.

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: HANG ON. THIS IS ITEM NUMBER 8.
- 6 I'M SORRY?

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 8 IS CLASSIFICATION ACTIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE
- 9 BUDGET POSITIONS INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSED BUDGET.

10

- 11 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I HAVE THE WRONG-- HANG ON A
- 12 SECOND, GUYS. I GOT TO SEE WHAT WE'RE DOING HERE. YEAH, OKAY.
- 13 MR. KNABE?

14

15 SUP. KNABE: I WOULD INTRODUCE AND WAIVE READING.

16

- 17 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. SECOND BY MS. MOLINA.
- 18 IS THERE ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION? WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS
- 19 VOTE.

20

- 21 CLERK SACHI HAMAI: BEFORE WE GO ON, I BELIEVE I'M SUPPOSED TO
- 22 READ THIS INTO THE RECORD.

23

24 C.A.O. JANSSEN: READ IT. OKAY.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. BEFORE WE CAST THE
- 2 UNANIMOUS VOTE, YOU CAN READ IT INTO THE RECORD.

3

- 4 CLERK SACHI HAMAI: OKAY. THIS IS THE SHORT TITLE-- THIS IS A
- 5 ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 6, SALARIES, OF THE LOS ANGELES
- 6 COUNTY CODE RELATING TO THE ADDITION, DELETION, AND CHANGING
- 7 OF CERTAIN CLASSIFICATION AND MEMBER OF ORDINANCE POSITION IN
- 8 VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AS A RESULT OF THE BUDGET PROCESS FOR
- 9 FISCAL YEAR 2007/2008 AND THE DELETION AND AMENDMENT OF
- 10 VARIOUS DEPARTMENTAL PROVISIONS TO REMOVE OBSOLETE REFERENCES
- 11 AND IMPROPERLY ALIGNED DEPARTMENTAL PROVISIONS.

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. MR. KNABE MOVES, MOLINA
- 14 SECONDS, WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

- 16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM NUMBER 9, MR. CHAIR, IS OUR
- 17 RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEBT MANAGEMENT BAN AUTHORIZATION
- 18 REIMBURSEMENT RESOLUTION. THE BOARD HAS, OVER THE YEARS,
- 19 ADOPTED POLICY FOR THE RATIO OF ALLOWABLE ISSUANCE COMPARED TO
- 20 THE BUDGET AS A WHOLE. WE ARE UNDER ALL OF THOSE LIMITS. ALL
- 21 OF THESE ITEMS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ITEM 4, SHOULD BE
- 22 FAMILIAR TO YOU FROM PREVIOUS BUDGETS. ITEM NUMBER 4 IS AN
- 23 ISSUE WE HAVE WITH F.E.M.A. IT IS A CASH FLOW PROBLEM. WE CAN
- 24 NOT COLLECT ALL OF F.E.M.A. UNTIL THE PROJECT'S COMPLETED. SO



- 1 CONSIDER THIS ALSO A TECHNICAL ITEM, NUMBER 9. RECOMMENDING
- 2 YOUR APPROVAL.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IS THERE ANY DISCUSSION ON THIS
- 5 ITEM? IF NOT, MS. BURKE MOVES. MR. KNABE SECONDS. WITHOUT
- 6 OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE ON ITEM NUMBER 9.

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE NEXT THREE ITEMS, 10, 11, 12, ARE ALL
- 9 REPORTS. ITEM NUMBER 10, WE HAD TWO MOTIONS, ONE FROM
- 10 SUPERVISOR KNABE, ONE FROM SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH TO ASK US TO
- 11 TAKE A LOOK AT THE FIELD SERVICES CASELOADS IN PROBATION
- 12 DEPARTMENT. WE DID RECEIVE A PROPOSAL FROM THE DEPARTMENT
- 13 ASKING FOR ALMOST 600 NEW POSITIONS AND \$44 MILLION. WE HAVE
- 14 REMAINING IN P.F.U. ONGOING, JUST 13.6 MILLION. WE'RE TAKING A
- 15 LOOK AT THAT PROPOSAL NOW AND WOULD RECOMMEND, AT THIS POINT,
- 16 THAT YOU DEFER ANY FURTHER ACTION ON THOSE TWO ITEMS TO
- 17 SUPPLEMENTAL WHEN WE'LL HAVE A MORE COMPLETE REPORT ON THE
- 18 DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST AND HOW, AS A PRIORITY, IT STACKS UP
- 19 AGAINST THE D.O.J. REQUIREMENTS AND PROBATION.

20

21 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. ANY OBJECTION TO THAT?

22

- 23 SUP. MOLINA: ARE WE GETTING THIS INFORMATION? I'M SORRY? WE'RE
- 24 GOING TO GET THIS INFORMATION?



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES.

2

3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IN SEPTEMBER.

4

5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, YOU WILL.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WITHOUT OBJECTION, THIS WILL BE
- 8 ROLLED OVER 'TIL SEPTEMBER.

- 10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ALL RIGHT. ITEM NUMBER 11 HAS TO DO WITH-- AND
- 11 WE DID FILE A LETTER WITH YOUR BOARD ON FRIDAY, I BELIEVE, ON-
- 12 THIS IS ON THE REOPENING OF BEDS AT PITCHESS DETENTION
- 13 CENTER. WE HAVE INCLUDED IN CHANGE LETTER, AS I INDICATED,
- 14 \$7.2 MILLION TO ADD APPROXIMATELY 240 BEDS TO PITCHESS. THE
- 15 REPORT RECOMMENDS THAT THAT NUMBER BE INCREASED TO 504
- 16 ADDITIONAL BEDS BUT THAT WOULD COST AN ADDITIONAL \$4.1
- 17 MILLION, WHICH WE'RE PROPOSING COME OUT OF SPECIAL DEPARTMENT-
- 18 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT SPECIAL FUNDS, WHICH THEY'RE NOT TOO
- 19 WILD ABOUT. THE REPORT EXPLAINS THE LAST THREE YEARS OF
- 20 DEPARTMENT ALLOCATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PITCHESS SPECIFICALLY.
- 21 I THINK THERE'S A DISAGREEMENT ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT FUNDING
- 22 WAS AVAILABLE AT PITCHESS TO EXPAND THE BEDS. IN ANY EVENT, AT
- 23 THIS POINT, WE ARE RECOMMENDING 7.2 MILLION BE ADDED TO THE
- 24 SHERIFF'S BUDGET TO EXPAND PITCHESS AND 4.1 MILLION-- ARE WE



- 1 STILL RECOMMENDING THAT? I THINK THERE'S A MOTION. I
- 2 UNDERSTAND THERE'S A MOTION.

3

- 4 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHERE WERE YOU RECOMMENDING THAT
- 5 THE...

6

7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 7.2 MILLION IS GENERAL FUND.

8

9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO WHAT WAS THE SPECIAL FUND...

10

11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 4.1 MILLION OUT OF DEPARTMENT SPECIAL FUNDS.

12

13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: IS THAT PART OF YOUR ACTION?

14

- 15 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT'S PART OF-- NO, IT'S PART OF A LETTER,
- 16 SEPARATE, ON THIS ITEM. IT'S-- 7.2 MILLION IS INCLUDED IN THE
- 17 BUDGET. 4.1 IS NOT.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: AND SO WHEN IS THE 4.1 GOING TO BE
- 20 DEALT WITH?

21

22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IN THIS MOTION.

23

24 SUP. ANTONOVICH: BY MOTION, MR. CHAIRMAN.



1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY, MR. ANTONOVICH.

2

- 3 SUP. ANTONOVICH: C.E.O.'S JUNE 15TH REPORT HAS INDICATED A
- 4 NUMBER OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES AND IT'S IMPERATIVE THAT THE BOARD
- 5 MOVE FORWARD WITH THE REOPENING OF AVAILABLE JAIL BEDS AS
- 6 OUICKLY AND RESPONSIBLY AS POSSIBLE TO EASE THE OVERCROWDING
- 7 AND ENHANCE THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF OUR INMATES AND STAFF.
- 8 SO I WOULD MOVE THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE TRANSFER OF \$7.2
- 9 MILLION IN THE P.F.U. TO THE SHERIFF BUDGET TO REOPEN 252
- 10 BEDS, WHICH WILL RESULT IN 1,080 OPEN BEDS AT THE PITCHESS
- 11 SOUTH FACILITY EFFECTIVE NEXT MONTH AND REQUEST THE C.A.O. AND
- 12 THE SHERIFF TO PROVIDE A WRITTEN REPORT BY JUNE 28TH, FOLLOWED
- 13 BY AN ORAL PRESENTATION ON JULY 3RD BOARD MEETING WITH A FULL
- 14 REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE REOPENING OF THE ENTIRE
- 15 PITCHESS SOUTH FACILITY AND REQUEST THE C.A.O. AND THE SHERIFF
- 16 TO PROVIDE A JOINT WRITTEN REPORT BY SEPTEMBER 6TH, FOLLOWED
- 17 BY THE ORAL PRESENTATION AT THE SEPTEMBER 11TH BOARD MEETING
- 18 ON THE STATUS OF THE JAIL EXPANSION PLAN APPROVED ON AUGUST
- 19 1ST, 2006, ALONG WITH THE FULL ANALYSIS OF EACH OF THE JAIL
- 20 FACILITIES, INCLUDING THE RATED BED COUNT, BROKEN DOWN BY THE
- 21 NUMBER THAT ARE FUNDED VERSUS UNFUNDED, THE NUMBER OF FUNDED
- 22 POSITIONS AS WELL AS THE OPENING OF THE-- AS WELL AS THE
- 23 OPERATING BUDGET.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. IT'S SECONDED BY MS.
- 2 MOLINA.

3

4 SUP. MOLINA: SECOND.

5

- 6 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: NOW, CAN YOU TELL ME WHERE THE 4.1
- 7 POINT IS ADDRESSED?

8

- 9 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE BUDGET, THE WAY I READ THE MOTION, THEY
- 10 ARE MOVING TO APPROVE THE 7.2 MILLION THAT'S INCLUDED IN
- 11 CHANGE LETTER TO BRING THE BED CAPACITY AT PITCHESS TO 1,080
- 12 BEDS AND THEN NOT TO ADDRESS THE 4.1 MILLION. HAVE US REPORT
- 13 BACK ON THE REMAINING BEDS AT PITCHESS AND HOW THEY WOULD BE
- 14 FUNDED TO OPEN THEM IF THE BOARD CHOOSES TO DO SO. SO THE ONLY
- 15 ACTION YOU'RE TAKING TODAY IS APPROVING THE 7.2 MILLION IN
- 16 CHANGE LETTER BY WAY OF ALLOCATION.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WHAT CAUSED YOU TO CHANGE YOUR
- 19 RECOMMENDATION OF LEAVING IT IN THE P.F.U. TO MOVING IT INTO
- 20 THE BUDGET DIRECTLY ON FRIDAY AFTERNOON?

21

- 22 SUP. ANTONOVICH: AN EVENING IN EUROPE, RIGHT? WHAT WAS HER
- 23 NAME IN GERMANY?



- 1 SUP. KNABE: IS THE MOTION THEN TO MOVE IT OUT OF P.F.U.
- 2 WITHOUT KNOWING WHAT THEY'RE GOING TO DO WITH IT?

3

4 SUP. MOLINA: YEAH, IT'S SUPPOSED TO GO TO BUILD THE BEDS.

5

- 6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: IT WAS PUT IN P.F.U. AS PART OF THE CHANGE
- 7 LETTER BECAUSE WE WERE STILL WORKING WITH THE SHERIFF'S
- 8 DEPARTMENT TO TRY TO UNDERSTAND-- TO RECONCILE THE BEDS TO
- 9 FUNDING OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS. THAT'S WHY IT WENT INTO
- 10 P.F.U. WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO IT GOING INTO THE SHERIFF'S
- 11 BUDGET AND OPENING THOSE BEDS RIGHT AWAY. IT NEEDS TO BE DONE.

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ASSUMING THEY WOULD OPEN THOSE
- 14 BEDS RIGHT AWAY BUT I...

15

16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT, WELL-- RIGHT.

17

- 18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ...THERE'S A DISPUTE ABOUT BEDS
- 19 ALL OVER THE PLACE HERE. I DON'T WANT TO GET INTO IT TODAY.
- 20 BUT, YOU KNOW, MONEY, ONCE IT GOES INTO THE SHERIFF'S BUDGET,
- 21 WE LOSE CONTROL OVER IT AND...

22

23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S TRUE.



1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ...AND THEY ARE NOT OBLIGATED TO

2 USE IT TO OPEN UP BEDS.

3

4 SUP. KNABE: THAT'S WHAT BOTHERS ME, I MEAN, BECAUSE WHEN IS IT

5 GOING TO IMPACT THE EARLY RELEASE PROGRAM?

6

- 7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I DON'T DISAGREE WITH THAT, SUPERVISOR, BUT
- 8 THERE'S NOTHING THAT WE CAN DO IN THE NEXT TWO WEEKS OR THREE
- 9 MONTHS TO CHANGE THAT FACT. WHENEVER WE GIVE HIM THE MONEY, HE
- 10 CAN USE IT ANYWHERE HE WANTS. WE AGREE THAT THERE'S AN URGENT
- 11 NEED FOR THE BEDS NOW AND AT LEAST FOR THE NEXT SIX MONTHS
- 12 WHEN WE CAN TRACK HIS BUDGET, HE WOULD BE HARD PRESSED TO
- 13 SPEND IT FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN OPENING PITCHESS AND THEY
- 14 REPORT DAILY ON BED CAPACITY AND BEDS FILLED. SO WE ACTUALLY
- 15 KNOW ON A DAY-TO-DAY BASIS. THAT'S ONE OF THE REASONS WE HAD A
- 16 QUESTION ABOUT THIS IS, IN JANUARY/FEBRUARY TIME FRAME,
- 17 PITCHESS WAS RUNNING AT ABOUT 1,300 FILLED BEDS OR SO. AFTER
- 18 THEIR INTERNAL CURTAILMENTS, THAT DROPPED DOWN TO 700. SO WE
- 19 CAN TRACK, ON A DAILY BASIS, WHETHER OR NOT WHETHER THE MONEY
- 20 IS ACTUALLY GOING INTO ADDITIONAL BEDS AT PITCHESS. SO WE
- 21 DON'T HAVE AN OBJECTION TO MOVING THE MONEY INTO HIS BUDGET.

22

23 SUP. MOLINA: MR. CHAIRMAN?



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YOU DON'T HAVE ANY CONTROL OVER
- 2 WHAT THEY DO TO IT, SO THEREFORE YOU DON'T OBJECT...

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, WHETHER I DO IT NOW OR FOUR MONTHS FROM
- 5 NOW, I STILL DON'T HAVE ANY MORE CONTROL OVER IT IS MY POINT.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, NO, EXCEPT THAT IF, FOUR
- 8 MONTHS FROM NOW, THEY HAVE PURCHASE ORDERS READY TO GO OR
- 9 WHATEVER THE BUREAUCRACY IS, THE ACTUAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS
- 10 TO...

11

- 12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THEY CAN RUN THE BEDS THERE NOW WE KNOW
- 13 BECAUSE THEY'VE BEEN RUNNING IT EARLIER THIS YEAR. YOU
- 14 REMEMBER THE ISSUE ABOUT THE PHANTOM POSITIONS?

15

16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YES.

17

- 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, APPARENTLY, PART OF THOSE PHANTOM
- 19 POSITIONS WERE RUNNING PITCHESS. WE DIDN'T KNOW THAT. SO NOW
- 20 WE'RE SIMPLY REPLACING PHANTOM POSITIONS SO THEY CAN INCREASE
- 21 THE CAPACITY OF PITCHESS. SO THEY DON'T NEED TO DO ANYTHING.

22

- 23 SUP. KNABE: WELL, WE DO HAVE SOMEONE HERE FROM THE SHERIFF'S
- 24 DEPARTMENT. MAYBE THEY CAN COME DOWN AND REASSURE US.



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, YOU GOT A BUNCH OF PEOPLE
- 2 HERE.

3

- 4 SUP. BURKE: WAS THERE AN ADDITIONAL REQUEST FOR 4.1? IS THAT
- 5 SEPARATE?

6

- 7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, THE TOTAL COAST OF REOPENING PITCHESS TO
- 8 ITS CAPACITY OF 1,500 BEDS IS \$21 MILLION. WE'RE ONLY AT 7.2.
- 9 SO WE WERE SUGGESTING THAT WE COULD ADD A FEW MORE BEDS BY
- 10 TAKING 4.1 MILLION OUT OF THEIR INMATE FUNDS AND USING IT FOR
- 11 THAT PURPOSE. SO THE DIFFERENCE IS UNFUNDED AT THIS POINT AND
- 12 I THINK THE SUBJECT OF THE MOTION BY SUPERVISORS ANTONOVICH
- 13 AND MOLINA TO REPORT BACK WITH A DISCUSSION OF THAT ISSUE.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, I'LL TELL YOU WHAT I'D LIKE
- 16 TO ASK AS PART OF A REPORT BACK IF THIS IS GOING TO GO
- 17 FORWARD. I'D PREFER PERSONALLY, IF IT WAS UP TO ME, I'D HOLD
- 18 IT BACK UNTIL WE KNEW EXACTLY WHEN THEY WERE GOING TO DO THIS.
- 19 IS THIS, BY THE WAY, IS THIS 7.1-- 7.2 PLUS THE 4.1, IS THAT
- 20 AN ANNUALIZED COST?

21

22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THE 7.2 IS, YES.

23

24 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: FOR WHAT, FOR HOW MANY BEDS?



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: FOR 240 BEDS, I THINK.

2

- 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, MAYBE-- HAVE THEY TOLD YOU
- 4 THAT THEY ARE GOING TO OPEN THOSE BEDS ON JULY THE FIRST?

5

6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES.

7

- 8 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, WHY DON'T THEY COME DOWN
- 9 HERE?

10

11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ALL RIGHT. COME ON DOWN.

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THEY COULDN'T BE FARTHER AWAY FROM
- 14 THE BOARD THAN THEY ARE PHYSICALLY AND OTHERWISE HERE. MR.
- 15 JANSSEN, WHAT I'D LIKE YOU TO COME BACK WITH AT THE NEXT--
- 16 WHEN IS IT, JULY 3RD?

17

18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, JULY 3RD.

19

- 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, ACTUALLY IN YOUR JUNE 28TH
- 21 REPORT, WE HAVE SET ASIDE AND APPROPRIATED MONEY TO THE
- 22 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT FOR THE JAILS ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS IN
- 23 THE LAST SEVERAL YEARS. BIG BUCKS. I DON'T KNOW, I DIDN'T COME
- 24 PREPARED TO LAY IT OUT BUT YOUR STAFF KNOWS WHAT IT IS.



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES, WE HAVE IT.

2

- 3 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I'D LIKE YOU TO DO A FORENSIC
- 4 ANALYSIS OF WHERE THAT MONEY WENT AND DID IT GET SPENT FOR THE
- 5 PURPOSES FOR WHICH THIS BOARD APPROPRIATED IT? JUST LIKE WE'RE
- 6 BEING ASKED NOW TO APPROPRIATE \$7.2 MILLION FOR 250 BEDS THAT
- 7 WE MAY OR MAY NOT EVER SEE OPENED, I WANT TO KNOW WHAT
- 8 HAPPENED TO THE TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS THAT WE HAVE SET
- 9 ASIDE FOR JAILS FOR THE OPENING OF NEW BEDS.

10

11 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT IS ITEM 3 ON THEIR MOTION, SUPERVISOR.

12

13 SUP. ANTONOVICH: ITEM NUMBER 3 WHERE WE WERE ASKING THAT...

14

15 SUP. MOLINA: EXCEPT IT DOESN'T SAY FORENSIC.

16

17 C.A.O. JANSSEN: [LAUGHS] BUT IT'S THE SAME IDEA.

18

- 19 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: BUT I DON'T WANT TO WAIT UNTIL
- 20 SEPTEMBER TO GET IT. I WANT TO GET IT NOW.

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: WELL, WE CAN'T DO IT BY NEXT WEEK BUT WE CAN
- 23 DO IT BEFORE SEPTEMBER. WE'LL DO IT AS SOON AS WE CAN BUT WE
- 24 CAN'T DO IT WITHIN A WEEK. I MEAN, WE CAN TELL YOU-- WE CAN
- 25 TELL YOU HOW MUCH MONEY HAS BEEN APPROPRIATED, HOW MUCH MONEY



- 1 HAS BEEN SET ASIDE, HOW MANY BEDS WE THINK, BUT THIS IS A
- 2 QUESTION OF-- OH, I CAN DO IT RIGHT NOW. MAYBE EVEN PAUL CAN
- 3 DO IT IF YOU WANT TO...

4

- 5 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: WELL, HE MAY OR MAY NOT BE ABLE TO
- 6 DO IT. CERTAINLY HE'LL BE ABLE TO SAY SOMETHING BUT I'D LIKE
- 7 YOU TO VERIFY IT. I MEAN, I'VE BEEN DOWN THIS ROAD BEFORE. ALL
- 8 RIGHT. WHO WANTS TO SPEAK? WANT TO GO BY RANK OR BY KNOWLEDGE
- 9 BASE?

10

11 SUP. KNABE: WHO WANTS TO SAY "TRUST US" FIRST? [LAUGHTER]

- 13 PAUL TANAKA: FIRST OF ALL, MR. CHAIRMAN, WE DO HAVE A CHART
- 14 THAT SHOWS THE 68 PLUS MILLION DOLLARS THAT YOUR BOARD HAS
- 15 ALLOCATED OVER THE COURSE OF THE LAST THREE YEARS SPECIFICALLY
- 16 FOR CUSTODY POSITIONS, 4,474 BEDS AND APPROXIMATELY 732
- 17 PERSONNEL POSITIONS, I BELIEVE, AND THAT IS ALL LAID OUT RIGHT
- 18 THERE FOR C.R.D.F., TWIN TOWERS AND A COUPLE OF COMPOUNDS AT
- 19 THE RANCH FACILITY. WHAT WE'RE LOOKING FOR HERE IS WE HAVE
- 20 ABOUT 800 BEDS THAT ARE CURRENTLY OPENED AT THE NORTH ANNEX,
- 21 WHICH IS FORMALLY KNOWN AS PITCHESS DETENTION CENTER SOUTH
- 22 FACILITY. WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE, IN COMPLIANCE WITH CREATING
- 23 MORE BED SPACE IN THE RUTHERFORD PANEL, THE ABILITY TO OPEN
- 24 THAT UP AS A FULL COMPOUND WITH A SEPARATE COMMAND, AS IT WAS
- 25 ONCE BEFORE. THE \$7.2 MILLION WILL ALLOW US TO OPEN UP ANOTHER



- 1 252 MORE BEDS, IN ADDITION TO PUTTING A FULL COMMAND STAFF IN
- 2 PLACE. WHAT'S CURRENTLY AT ISSUE IS THE REMAINING 8 POINT-- I
- 3 GUESS IT WAS ABOUT \$8 MILLION OR SO, 8-1/2 MILLION DOLLARS
- 4 THAT WE NEED TO COMPLETELY REOPEN SOUTH FACILITY AND THAT'S
- 5 WHAT MR. JANSSEN WAS REFERRING TO, POSSIBLY SOME OF IT COMING
- 6 FROM THE SPECIAL FUNDS, SUCH AS THE INMATE WELFARE FUND, AND
- 7 THEN HAVING TO FIND THE REMAINING, SAY, 4, 4-1/2 MILLION
- 8 DOLLARS.

9

- 10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: YOU'D JUST GET US AN ANALYSIS OF
- 11 THIS AND IN YOUR INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS AS QUICKLY AS YOU CAN,
- 12 THANKS. ALL RIGHT, MS. MOLINA?

- 14 SUP. MOLINA: MR. CHAIRMAN, LET ME ASK A QUESTION BECAUSE, YOU
- 15 KNOW, I THINK IT'S LEGITIMATE TO SAY THAT WE NEVER KNOW HOW
- 16 MANY BEDS WE HAVE AND WE NEVER KNOW HOW MANY PRISONERS WE HAVE
- 17 AND WE NEVER KNOW WHERE WE'RE AT BUT WE DO KNOW THIS. WE'RE
- 18 GETTING IN TROUBLE ALL THE TIME FOR THIS. AND SO I'M A LITTLE
- 19 BIT CONCERNED. YOU KNOW, I WANT TO PROVIDE THE MONEY BECAUSE I
- 20 WANT TO PROVIDE THE BEDS BUT I MUST TELL YOU THERE IS
- 21 SUSPICION ON THIS SIDE OF THE TABLE THAT THIS MONEY IS GOING
- 22 TO GET ALLOCATED AND YOU ALL ARE NOT GOING TO USE IT FOR IT
- 23 AND I'M CONCERNED ABOUT THE ATTITUDE AND IT'S NOT UNFOUNDED. I
- 24 MEAN, WE'VE SEEN A LOT OF-- I DON'T KNOW WHAT IT IS. I MEAN,
- 25 WE WANT TO ALLOCATE THE MONEY. AND THAT DOESN'T MEAN THAT YOU



- 1 CAN BUY OTHER THINGS WITH IT, DO OTHER THINGS, IT IS TO OPEN
- 2 THE BEDS. THE END. AND I HOPE YOU UNDERSTAND THE SPIRIT OF IT
- 3 AND THE INTENT. AND I KNOW SUPERVISOR ANTONOVICH SUPPORTS THE
- 4 DEPARTMENT SOMETIMES WITHOUT EVEN QUESTION. BUT, ON THIS, I
- 5 HOPE HE WILL STAND WITH ME THAT, IF THEY DON'T USE THIS MONEY
- 6 TO OPEN UP THOSE BEDS, THAT, I MEAN, WE'RE GOING TO
- 7 SHORTCHANGE YOU IN OTHER AREAS. I MEAN, I REALLY MEAN IT. I
- 8 HOPE THAT'S NOT THE CASE AND I HOPE-- BUT THERE'S ENOUGH
- 9 SUSPICION ON THIS SIDE OF THE AISLE TO SAY THAT YOU SHOULD BE
- 10 NERVOUS.

11

- 12 PAUL TANAKA: SUPERVISOR MOLINA, I CAN ASSURE YOU, ON BEHALF OF
- 13 SHERIFF BACA, THAT THIS SOUTH FACILITY WILL BE OPENED AS WE
- 14 ARE PROPOSING WITH THE FUNDS...

15

- 16 SUP. MOLINA: AND WE WILL HAVE THOSE ADDITIONAL BEDS AVAILABLE
- 17 AND IT WILL BE ONGOING?

18

19 PAUL TANAKA: YES, MA'AM.

20

21 SUP. MOLINA: FOR THAT AMOUNT OF MONEY?

22

23 PAUL TANAKA: YES, MA'AM.



- 1 SUP. MOLINA: I THINK THAT'S THE ASSURANCES THAT STAFF WANT TO
- 2 HEAR AND I HOPE IT'S NOT GOING TO BE A BETRAYAL LATER ON IN
- 3 TELLING US THERE'S SOMETHING ELSE GOING ON BECAUSE WE WANT TO
- 4 GET TO THE SAME GOAL AND THERE SHOULDN'T BE SUSPICION ON OUR
- 5 SIDE. I KNOW THAT THE LAW SAYS, YOU KNOW, ONCE I GET IT IN MY
- 6 BUDGET, I CAN DO WHATEVER I WANT. I MEAN, THAT'S HIS SIDE OF
- 7 HIS DEFENSE. BUT WHAT IT WOULD DO TO ME IN THE FUTURE, AND I
- 8 HAVE DONE IT BECAUSE I HAVE NOT TRUSTED IT, IS THAT I USUALLY
- 9 DON'T ALLOCATE UNTIL I ACTUALLY, YOU KNOW, AM READY TO SIGN
- 10 THE CHECK. SO I WANT YOU TO KNOW THAT THERE'S A LOT OF
- 11 SUSPICION ABOUT THAT. I HOPE, IN THIS INSTANCE, WE'RE NOT
- 12 GOING TO SEE, LATER ON, SIX MONTHS DOWN THE LINE, "WELL, WE
- 13 DON'T HAVE ENOUGH BEDS AND PITCHESS ONLY HAS 700 BEDS AND
- 14 WE'RE GOING TO SAY, BUT REMEMBER WE ALLOCATED THAT MONEY?" AND
- 15 EVERYBODY IS GOING TO START PLAYING THIS, I DON'T KNOW WHAT
- 16 YOU CALL IT, THIS WEIRD GAME THAT GOES ON EVERY TIME NUMBERS
- 17 COME UP IN THE SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT. SO I WOULD APPRECIATE
- 18 THAT YOU REALLY HONOR THAT COMMITMENT AND NOT JUST ON BEHALF
- 19 OF THE SHERIFF BUT THE ENTIRE DEPARTMENT HAS TO HONOR IT.
- 20 WHILE I UNDERSTAND THE LAW AND I WANT TO BE RESPECTFUL TO THE
- 21 LAW, I HOPE YOU UNDERSTAND OUR RESPONSIBILITY, AS WELL,
- 22 BECAUSE, WHEN WE GET SUED BY VARIOUS FOLKS ON THIS ISSUE, IT
- 23 IS THIS COUNTY THAT THEY SUE. THEY DON'T SUE THE SHERIFF. HE
- 24 DOESN'T HAVE A PRIVATE BUDGET TO RESOLVE HIS ISSUES. IT



```
HAPPENS. WE GET SUED AS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SO IT IS
2
    SERIOUS.
3
    PAUL TANAKA: YOU'RE CORRECT, SUPERVISOR, AND WE HAVE EVERY
4
5
    INTENTION TO NOT LET YOU DOWN ON THIS MATTER AND TO ENSURE
    THAT WE RUN THE SOUTH FACILITY AS PROPOSED.
6
7
8
    SUP. MOLINA: VERY GOOD.
9
    PAUL TANAKA: THANK YOU.
10
11
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. ANY OTHER DISCUSSION ON
12
13
    THIS MOTION? MR. KNABE, ANYTHING ELSE?
14
    SUP. KNABE: NO. I HAVE PAUL'S WORD. ON TAPE.
15
16
    PAUL TANAKA: THANK YOU.
17
18
19
    C.A.O. JANSSEN: ON VIDEO.
20
    SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: I'M GIVING YOU ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY
21
22
    THERE. [ LAUGHTER ]
23
    PAUL TANAKA: THANK YOU.
24
25
```



- 1 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. WITHOUT OBJECTION,
- 2 UNANIMOUS VOTE.

3

- 4 C.A.O. JANSSEN: OKAY. ITEM NUMBER 12 IS ALSO A REPORT FROM OUR
- 5 OFFICE ON THE STATUS OF PROBATION JUVENILE DETENTION CAMP
- 6 RECONFIGURATION CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT. THE BOTTOM LINE IS, THE
- 7 WORK HAS BEEN COMPLETED. IT'S IN DRAFT FORM. IT'S BEING
- 8 REVIEWED AND WE ARE PROPOSING TO BRIEF YOUR OFFICES DURING THE
- 9 WEEK OF JULY 16TH ON WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE AND THEN THE
- 10 INFORMATION WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR SEPTEMBER. THERE IS NO MONEY
- 11 IN THE BUDGET SET ASIDE FOR THIS PURPOSE. SO THIS WOULD BE A
- 12 RECEIVE AND FILE.

13

14 SUP. KNABE: MOVE WE RECEIVE AND FILE.

15

16 SUP. BURKE: WHAT'S THE ESTIMATED COST ON THE RECONFIGURATION?

17

18 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THE ESTIMATED COST ON WHAT?

19

20 SUP. BURKE: RECONFIGURATION.

21

- 22 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S IN THE REPORT. THE RANGE IS FROM 50
- 23 MILLION TO 1.1 BILLION SO...

24

25 SUP. BURKE: WAIT A MINUTE. FROM 50 MILLION....



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT. IT DEPENDS ON, OBVIOUSLY, WHAT YOU DO 2 3 AT EACH CAMP. 4 5 SUP. KNABE: THAT'S A PRETTY SAFE RANGE. 6 7 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I DIDN'T NEED TO PAY ANYBODY TO GET TO THAT 8 RANGE. 9 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ISN'T THAT THE C.A.O.'S SALARY 10 11 RANGE? 12 13 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THAT'S MY SALARY RANGE. [LAUGHTER] 14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: BUT THE 1 BILLION IS RECONFIGURING 15 16 EVERY CAMP IN AMERICA AND THE SOVIET UNION. 17 18 C.A.O. JANSSEN: I'M SURE, YES. ALL NEW FACILITIES, RIGHT. 19 OKAY. ITEM NUMBER 13 IS APPROVE THE... 20 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE A REPORT 21 22 ON THAT? 23 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THIRD WEEK OF JULY, WE'LL BRIEF YOUR BOARD 24

25 OFFICES.



1

- 2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. THEN, WITHOUT
- 3 OBJECTION, IT WILL BE RECEIVED AND FILED. KNABE MOVED IT.
- 4 MOLINA SECONDS IT.

5

- 6 C.A.O. JANSSEN: 13, APPROVE THE REVISED FIGURES AND DIRECT
- 7 THE-- INSTRUCT THE AUDITOR TO PREPARE AND PRESENT THE FINAL
- 8 RESOLUTION, WHICH IS ITEM 15.

9

10 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: SO ITEM 13 IS BEFORE US?

11

12 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YES.

13

14 SUP. BURKE: I'LL MOVE THAT.

15

- 16 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MS. BURKE MOVES, MR. ANTONOVICH
- 17 SECONDS, WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE.

18

- 19 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ITEM 14 ARE ROUTINE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS THAT
- 20 YOU SEE EVERY YEAR TO HELP US MANAGE THE BUDGET THROUGHOUT THE
- 21 YEAR.

22

23 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: THAT'S WHAT THIS IS.

24

25 C.A.O. JANSSEN: THERE'S MUSIC CENTER...



1

- 2 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: RIGHT. SO WE NEED A MOTION ON ITEM
- 3 14? MS. BURKE MOVES.

4

5 C.A.O. JANSSEN: RIGHT, NEED A MOTION ON ITEM 14.

6

- 7 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: MS. BURKE MOVES, MS. MOLINA
- 8 SECONDS, UNANIMOUS VOTE ON 14.

9

- 10 C.A.O. JANSSEN: ALL RIGHT. IF THE AUDITOR, TYLER HAS A FIGURE
- 11 ON ITEM 15 FOR THE FINAL BUDGET RESOLUTION.

12

13 TYLER MCCAULEY: I NEED FIVE MINUTES.

14

- 15 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: FIVE MINUTES? WE HAVE A MEMBER OF
- 16 THE PUBLIC WHO WANTS TO BE HEARD ON ITEM 17. WE'RE JUST GOING
- 17 TO HOLD ITEM 15 FOR NOW. MR. THIGPEN? OR MS. THIGPEN, I'M
- 18 SORRY.

- 20 JANET THIGPEN: HI. MY NAME IS JANET THIGPEN. I'M NOT TRYING
- 21 TO-- I KNOW THAT THIS IS THE BUDGET MEETING. IT HAS SOMETHING
- 22 TO DO WITH THE FISCAL YEAR, AS WELL AS IT HAS SOMETHING TO DO
- 23 WITH THE REVENUE OF THE CITY. THE REASON THAT I CAME HERE IS
- 24 TO FIRST TO ASK THE QUESTION, THE REVENUE OF THE CITY HAS
- 25 SOMETHING TO DO WITH THE BUDGET, AS WELL AS THE INFLUX OF THE



- I INCOME THAT COMES THROUGH THE CITY. IT ALSO HAS SOMETHING TO
- 2 DO WITH, I GUESS, THE COMPANIES AND THINGS THAT ACTUALLY
- 3 REVOLVES AROUND THE CITY TO ACTUALLY RUN THE CITY. YOU HAVE
- 4 SOME KIND OF DECEPTIVE PRACTICE THAT'S GOING THROUGH YOUR
- 5 FIRST AND TEMPLE COURTHOUSE. THERE IS A
- 6 PROVOKING MANIACAL, AS WELL AS ASININE INDIVIDUAL PERSON NAMED
- 7 PAMELA K. JONES. SHE AND HER FAMILY COHORT A WAY OF GETTING
- 8 HOLD OF A INDUSTRY THAT IS NOT LEGALLY OR ETHICALLY THEIRS.
- 9 THE THEORY WAS FALSE PRETENSE, PERJURY, THINGS OF THAT NATURE
- 10 TRYING TO GET A HOLD OF THIS. THE BAD THING ABOUT IT IS IT CAN
- 11 NEVER BELONG TO THEM BECAUSE THE TITLE IS IN MY NAME. I, AS A
- 12 PERSON, COULD DO A LOT OF THINGS BUT IN A ROUNDABOUT WAY I'M
- 13 TRYING TO RESOLVE IT IN A JUSTIFIED WAY. THE WAY IN WHICH THEY
- 14 THOUGHT THEY COULD ACTUALLY GET A HOLD OF MY THINGS, THEY
- 15 ACTUALLY THOUGHT THEY CAN DO DURESS. THEY THOUGHT THEY CAN
- 16 ACTUALLY GO AGAINST THE F.T.C. FEDERAL GUIDELINE. THEY GOT
- 17 MARIE MADOW FORGING ALL THROUGHOUT THE CITY. THEY ARE HAVING A
- 18 GREAT TIME TRYING TO RUN AMUCK OVER JANET NAME. IN ALL
- 19 THEORIES, THEY DON'T HAVE A EIGHTH GRADE EDUCATION TO SAY THEY
- 20 CAN DO ANYTHING. THEY ALL NEED TO GO BACK TO HIGH SCHOOL.
- 21 THAT'S HOW BAD IT IS. I, AS A PERSON, WILL NEVER, AS A WHOLE,
- 22 COULD EVER FORGIVE THEM. I REALLY HATE TASHA. I CAN'T STAND
- 23 PAM. I CAN'T EVEN EXPLAIN HOW IS IT THAT A 30-YEAR-OLD WOMAN
- 24 WENT TO THE COURTHOUSE AND TRIED TO PRETEND LIKE SHE WAS 17
- 25 FOR WHAT WAS IT EMANCIPATION OF A 17-YEAR-OLD. IF YOU



- 1 FINGERPRINT HER, SHE'S 33 YEARS OLD. YOU KNOW, AND MOST PEOPLE
- 2 LOOK AT ME AND SAY HOW AND WHY AND, TO ME, I'M TRYING TO
- 3 FIGURE OUT HOW COULD THEY EVER DO SOMETHING OF THAT NATURE
- 4 KNOWING THAT, IF IF YOU WAS TO CATCH IT, YOU'D BE VERY ANGRY
- 5 WITH IT. THEY CAN'T PASS EIGHTH GRADE. THEY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL
- 6 IS NOT EXTRAORDINARY. IT'S A EIGHTH GRADE EDUCATION. THAT'S
- 7 WHY THEY'RE DOING THE THINGS THAT THEY'RE DOING LIKE FORGERY
- 8 AND FALSE PRETENSE AND THINGS I FIND HIGHLY-- IT'S ALMOST
- 9 EMBARRASSING EVEN FOR ME. MARIE MADOW CAN'T EVEN PASS OR GET A
- 10 C.N.A. LICENSE. THAT'S A EIGHTH GRADE EDUCATION. THAT'S NOT A
- 11 L.V.N., WHICH IS LIKE A TENTH GRADE EDUCATION. R.N. IS 12TH
- 12 GRADE EDUCATION.

13

- 14 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THAT
- 15 CLOSES THE PUBLIC HEARING. IS THE CONTROLLER READY?

16

- 17 J. TYLER MCCAULEY: MR. CHAIR, WE HAVE ALL THE INFORMATION
- 18 NEEDED TO PREPARE THE FINAL BUDGET RESOLUTION. ACCORDINGLY, IF
- 19 YOUR BOARD DESIRES, IT CAN NOW ADOPT THE FINAL BUDGET
- 20 RESOLUTION, WHICH IS ITEM NUMBER 15.

21

- 22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: ALL RIGHT. MR. KNABE MOVES, MS.
- 23 MOLINA SECONDS, WITHOUT OBJECTION, UNANIMOUS VOTE. DO WE HAVE
- 24 ANYTHING ELSE? ITEM 16?



1 C.A.O. JANSSEN: NO, WE DO NOT. WE ARE DONE.

2

- 3 SUP. KNABE: I JUST WANT TO COMPLIMENT THESE FOLKS UP HERE.
- 4 THIS F-5 THING, THIS WHOLE BUDGET-- BUT, I MEAN, BEING ABLE TO
- 5 HAVE IT ON OUR SCREENS HERE AS WELL, TOO. GREAT JOB,
- 6 EVERYBODY. EVERYBODY.

7

- 8 C.A.O. JANSSEN: YEAH, I'D LIKE TO ADD MY BUDGET STAFF,
- 9 DEPARTMENT, BOARD BUDGET DEPUTIES HAVE DONE AN INCREDIBLE JOB
- 10 TO PUT TOGETHER A REALLY IMPRESSIVE \$21.7 BILLION EXPENDITURE
- 11 PLAN. AND THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR...

12

- 13 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: DID YOU SAY FOUR BUDGET DEPUTIES?
- 14 THAT'S WHAT I THOUGHT I HEARD YOU SAY?

15

16 C.A.O. JANSSEN: FOR PUTTING TOGETHER.

17

- 18 SUP. ANTONOVICH: I WANT TO THANK DR. LORI HOWARD FOR A SUPERB
- 19 JOB AND MY STAFF, ALL MY DEPUTIES, CATHERINE, ANNA, ELLEN,
- 20 PAUL, PHILIP. THEY DID A VERY GOOD JOB.

21

22 SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: OKAY.

- 24 SUP. BURKE: AND GERARDO ON MY STAFF, THIS IS HIS FIRST TIME TO
- 25 DO BUDGET. [LAUGHTER]



SUP. BURKE: THIS IS HIS FIRST TIME AND SO I THINK HE GOT THROUGH IT. DID A VERY GOOD JOB. CONGRATULATIONS. SUP. KNABE: HOW ABOUT CARL, NICK AND RICK FROM MY STAFF? SUP. MOLINA: DON'T FORGET ABOUT LISA WHO HAD HER BABY TWO WEEKS AGO. SUP. BURKE: OH, YES. SUP. YAROSLAVSKY, CHAIRMAN: LET'S HEAR IT FOR THE BABY. THE BABY HAD SOMETHING TO DO WITH THIS. IT ACTUALLY SHOULD HAVE BEEN SIX STAFF, SIX BUDGET DEPUTIES, NOT FOUR. ALL RIGHT. WITHOUT ANY FURTHER DELAY, WE ARE ADJOURNED UNTIL TOMORROW MORNING.



1	I, JENNIFER A. HINES, Certified Shorthand Reporter
2	Number 6029/RPR/CRR qualified in and for the State of
3	California, do hereby certify:
4	That the transcripts of proceedings recorded by the
5	Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors June 18, 2007,
6	were thereafter transcribed into typewriting under my
7	direction and supervision;
8	That the transcript of recorded proceedings as
9	archived in the office of the reporter and which
10	have been provided to the Los Angeles County Board of
11	Supervisors as certified by me.
12	I further certify that I am neither counsel for, nor
13	related to any party to the said action; nor
14	in anywise interested in the outcome thereof.
15	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this
16	26th day of June 2007 for the County records to be used only
17	for authentication purposes of duly certified transcripts
18	as on file of the office of the reporter.
19	
20	JENNIFER A. HINES
21	CSR No. 6029/RPR/CRR
22	